

honor of Mr. MANN have been concluded. I ask that an order to that effect be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30 REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Whereas Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, deceased, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept such devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Therefore be it Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

Senate Joint Resolution 218, to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3220. An act amending sections 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, 19, 29, and 30 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13571) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 13572) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office building to be erected at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13573) to determine proceedings in cases of contested elections of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13574) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Pierre, S. Dak., to commemorate the explorations and discoveries of the Verendrye brothers, and to expend not to exceed \$25,000 therefor; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13575) to provide seed wheat for the drought-stricken area in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13576) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Wray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 13577) granting a pension to Ella Kinser Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13578) granting a pension to George H. Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13579) for the relief of Thomas F. Madden; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6678. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of K. Jacobs and 80 other residents of Pontiac, Mich., protesting against Turkish atrocities and requesting the Federal Government to initiate measures to restrain further violence in this respect; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6679. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Bronx Board of Trade, in the city of New York, N. Y., urging a central post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6680. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 42 residents of the State of California, favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6681. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Mr. Lyle L. Putney and 13 other residents of Arcadia, Mich., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 27, 1922.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast cared for us through the night season and hast granted us health and strength for the day and its duties. We look unto Thee this morning, asking that Thy guidance may be had and that every phase of life as presented to us may receive that kind consideration, that we may become more helpful in these days of need and of manifold problems, and finally receive Thine approbation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MEDILL McCORMICK, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ARIZONA.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], which have just been received. I ask that they may be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, HENRY F. ASHURST was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at the city of Phoenix, the capital, this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

By the acting governor:

ERNEST R. HALL.

JOHN MCK. REDMOND,
Assistant Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], certified by the governor, and ask to have the same read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, in the year 1922, ANDRIEUS A. JONES, Esq., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Merritt C. Mechem, and our seal hereto affixed, this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

MERRITT C. MECHEM.

EDITH WILEMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS presented resolutions adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Teton County, Mont., favoring the enactment of legislation for the taxation of unpatented lands on Government reclamation projects, which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bison and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pleasant Valley Local No. 652, Farmers' Union, of Lawrence, Kans., indorsing the rural credit bills pending in Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pleasant Valley Local No. 652, Farmers' Union, of Lawrence, Kans., protesting against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LADD presented the memorial of J. D. Myers and 19 other citizens, of Raub, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of George Kugler and 30 other citizens, of Fairmount, N. Dak., praying for the passage of legislation repealing the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Edgar Wagar and 21 other citizens, of McHenry County, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23, 1922, they presented the following enrolled bills to the President of the United States:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 4232) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Elephant Butte irrigation district, of New Mexico, and the El Paso County improvement district No. 1, of Texas, for the carrying out of the provisions of the convention between the United States and Mexico, proclaimed January 16, 1907, and providing compensation therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 4233) to provide for the appointment to higher grades of certain Army officers having conspicuously superior records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4234) granting a pension to Lillian H. Corcoran; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment providing for bringing 4,887 acres of Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the provisions and benefits of a drainage district, or-

ganized pursuant to the laws of said State, for the purpose of draining the lands within the Newlands irrigation project, and appropriating \$2,500 for the purpose of paying the first installment assessable against said Indian lands, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment providing that the enlisted forces of the Navy shall not exceed 67,000 men, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to reduce the appropriation for pay of the Navy from \$121,446,892 to \$91,446,892, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. REED of Missouri submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the so-called Borah amendment proposed to be submitted to the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of the Borah amendment the following: "The President is requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all American troops now stationed in Germany."

PROPOSED SILVER COMMISSION.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it may be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) was read, as follows:

Whereas the production of silver in the United States is a large and important industry affecting the welfare of important communities and of a large number of citizens; and

Whereas the United States has throughout its history favored silver as an important element of its monetary system and now views with anxiety the recent tendency of many influential nations of the world to lessen the use of silver as money, in some cases by ceasing its coinage for subsidiary and fractional denominations, in other cases by diminishing the silver contents of coins of the same nominal value; and

Whereas such tendencies, if unchecked, will have a serious and far-reaching effect upon the monetary customs of the world and will directly and indirectly injure one of the world's greatest industries, that of mining; and

Whereas the subject is a complex one, requiring the investigation of many abstruse and difficult problems and their consideration by many nations: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States appoint a commission of nine, to be known as a "silver commission," of whom not more than three shall be Members of the United States Senate and not more than three shall be Members of the United States House of Representatives; that such commission be authorized to communicate with such nations as may be feasible, either individually or in a joint conference to be arranged for that purpose; that such commission shall use its influence toward the resumption of the use of silver in the various monetary systems of nations which have abandoned or lessened its use and shall also lend its influence toward the adoption of any step that may tend to stabilize the value of silver in the world's market; that the commission after such investigation and conferences as it may deem advisable shall report to the President its recommendations and findings; that no compensation shall be allowed to any member of such commission as such, but the actual necessary expenses of the commission shall be borne by the United States.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I move that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The motion was agreed to.

THE RULES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submitted on Friday Senate Resolution 385. It is on the table, I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the table calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that it may still lie on the table, going over for the day. There is other business to come up this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request will be granted.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on December 27, 1922, the President approved and signed the act (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. HARRISON subsequently said: Mr. President, while it is very true that we are on the naval appropriation bill we can not lose sight of the important fight that is to proceed at an early date, I presume, touching ship subsidy.

A few days ago, on Tuesday, December 19, appearing in the Washington Post and other papers throughout the country—I read from the Washington Post—there was a statement issued

by Mr. Lasker, chairman of the Shipping Board, in which he said—I read from the headlines of the Washington Post—

Lasker denounces CAPPER's ship fight.

Statements published in Senator's paper declared biased and "at variance with facts."

Denies chief statements.

Says they were made on strength of minority report and are wholly erroneous.

The statement has been incorporated in the RECORD heretofore, but I desire to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD, so that those who are studying the ship subsidy bill may get some facts from it, this statement in the form of a letter from Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee, a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. I may say that Mr. DAVIS, in my opinion, is one of the best-versed men in the Congress touching this proposed ship subsidy legislation. He has given great thought to the question, and I am sure that he has sufficiently answered the chairman of the Shipping Board in this correspondence. I think it ought to be incorporated in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1922.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I note that Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, has written you a letter, which he gave to the press, in which he takes you to task by reason of the fact that Capper's Weekly is conducting a poll on the ship subsidy bill and because the questionnaire accompanying the ballots contains a statement of the issue which does not wholly meet the approval of Mr. Lasker. In other words, Chairman Lasker takes exception to the fact that you have not swallowed without question all of the false propaganda which he has been busily engaged in preparing and disseminating, at least in part at Government expense, instead of attending to his official duties; the statute creating the Shipping Board provides that "each commissioner shall devote his time to the duties of his office."

Mr. Lasker has the temerity to upbraid you because the questionnaire mentioned contained even a modicum of the argument and facts against the bill, although it contained a much fuller statement in favor of the bill, stated as strongly as any proponent of the bill has stated it, and occupying nearly three times as much space in the questionnaire as the only statement therein which can be construed as against the bill.

The fact of the business is that opponents of this bill have infinitely more cause for complaint against said questionnaire than has Chairman Lasker.

The statement in the questionnaire from Capper's Weekly for which Chairman Lasker upbraids you, and which he incorporates in his letter, is as follows:

"1. Do you favor a ship subsidy? In order to stop \$50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags it is proposed that the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately \$200,000,000, lend one hundred and twenty-five million to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about \$750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years. A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned. President Harding advocates the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce."

Mr. Lasker further asserts in his letter:

"The statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts; your words are taken, practically syllable for syllable, from this partisan minority report."

I emphatically deny that the major portion of the statement in the questionnaire is taken from the House minority report or that it represents my views or that of any other Member who signed such report. On the other hand, the statement that "in order to stop \$50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags it is proposed," is not only not in accord with the House minority report but each and every one of those contentions is denied and disproved in the said minority report, as was also done in speeches delivered in the House by all of us who signed the minority report.

The questionnaire contains the following statement: "A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned." While this is one of the chief arguments of the proponents of the bill and stated in the manner in which it is usually stated, yet under provisions of the bill the only subsidies which would be so returned would be for the current year and not any subsidies which had been paid in previous years. Furthermore, it is insisted by those opposed to this bill that there would be no refunds under this provision, for the reason that any surplus would be taken up in salaries, through subsidiary companies, etc., in order to avoid a refund.

It will be noted that this questionnaire directs the readers' attention to the fact that "President Harding advocates the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce." This is naturally calculated to largely influence the voter to whom the questionnaire is sent.

In fact, your questionnaire was more than fair to the bill and its advocates. As the readers of your papers are largely farmers, it would have been entirely proper for you to have called attention to the fact that this bill is not drafted or designed in the interest of cargo carriers, in which the farmers are interested, as has been conclusively and irrefutably shown. You could have well explained that this bill conferred more power on Chairman Lasker and his associates than good men ought to want or that bad men ought to be given.

The portion of said questionnaire which seems to have so riled Chairman Lasker is as follows:

"It is proposed: That the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately \$200,000,000, lend \$125,000,000 to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about \$750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years."

Mr. Lasker states: "I challenge one to find where the Shipping Board has ever proposed that the war-built merchant fleet be sold for approximately \$200,000,000." I accept that challenge.

The Shipping Board advertised the sale of the entire Government fleet last February. The New York Tribune of February 18, 1922, contained a front-page article which reads in part as follows:

"UNITED STATES TO SELL 1,470 SHIPS NEXT TUESDAY—ENTIRE MERCHANT FLEET, FROM 'LEVIATHAN' TO TUGS OFFERED—PROCEEDS FIGURED AT \$200,000,000—SUCCESS DEPENDS ON SUBSIDY'S PASSAGE—READY MARKET AT TOP PRICES ASSURED IF CONGRESS ADOPTS HARDING'S PLAN."

"WASHINGTON, February 17.—The entire fleet of merchant ships owned by the United States Government will be offered for sale on February 21 it was announced to-day by Joseph W. Powell, president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The total of 1,470 vessels included is expected to net the Government close to \$200,000,000, or an average of \$20 a ton."

"All classes and types of vessels will be included in the sale, in the expectation that if the administration's proposed subsidy bill is passed by Congress the ships will find a ready market and assure a large, permanent American merchant marine."

The New York Tribune is a loyal supporter of the administration and of this ship subsidy bill. Articles similar to the above appeared in the press generally at the time.

I made a speech in the House of Representatives February 21, 1922, in which I read the Tribune article in full and commented thereon. Representative HARDY of Texas followed with a speech on the same subject, in which he, among other things, stated: "The proposition goes out that the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation propose to sell those ships at a round sum of \$200,000,000." In fact, since said publications purporting to be an official announcement from the Shipping Board that it was expected that our fleet could be sold for approximately \$200,000,000, in the event of the passage of this bill, it has been generally accepted as the expected sale price, and has been so mentioned by various speakers and writers, and, so far as I have seen or heard, Mr. Lasker's letter to you is the first instance in which he or any other member of the Shipping Board has questioned the correctness of such statements.

The statute required that those ships should be duly appraised before sale, and during the hearings on this bill the Shipping Board was requested to file such appraisal for the information of the committee and the Congress, but Chairman Lasker, through Commissioner Lissner, refused to file it, as appears on page 840 of the hearings, as follows:

"Mr. LISSNER. Reference was also made to the appraisals of these ships that were mentioned in the advertisement. The chairman has requested me to say to the committee that he regards it as against the interest of the public and as having a very detrimental effect if these figures should go into the record. They were simply informal appraisals that were made for the information of the board itself, and, in our opinion, they should not go into the record or be handed in here at all."

Although admittedly there was no sale for the ships at the time and the bids received therefor were described by Chairman Lasker as "facetious"—"a joke" (hearings, p. 47), Commissioner Lissner of the Shipping Board admitted at the hearings (pp. 989-990) that "one of the purposes of the advertisement was to put ourselves in the position where we could sell the ships, having said we had advertised them." In other words, the statute provides that the ships shall be sold "at public or private competitive sale after appraisal and due advertisement." The Shipping Board took the position that having advertised the entire fleet for sale on a certain day was such compliance with the requirement for "due advertisement," that they could for a reasonable time thereafter sell any of the ships at private sale without further advertisement.

As to another purpose of said advertised sale, I call attention to the following from page 990 of the hearings:

"Mr. DAVIS. I want to ask you if another purpose of this advertised sale was not that you would receive bids for certain vessels of different types, and that that could be taken as a proper criterion upon which you would be justified in selling other ships subsequently at private sale at the same price?"

"Mr. LISSNER. It was the hope of the board that the bids that would come would be sufficiently illuminating and reliable so that we could make an estimate of the sales value of the ships; yes, sir."

"Mr. DAVIS. For future sales?"

"Mr. LISSNER. Yes, sir."

It was the contention of Chairman Lasker and other representatives of the Shipping Board at the hearings that our ships should be sold at not exceeding world market prices for similar tonnage, and that such world market price for first-class cargo vessels is about \$30 per ton or less. The large study prepared under the direction of the Shipping Board and widely distributed, states their position as follows:

"The Shipping Board should sell its remaining fleet as rapidly as possible at prices not to exceed the prevailing world market price for similar tonnage (p. 3).

"Moreover, it is clear that the sale of these ships to American owners on the proposed basis would merely tend to put those ships on a parity with similar foreign ships with respect to the first cost or book value and the fixed charges based thereon" (p. 83).

As evidence of the fact that this proposed sale only has reference to the half of our ships which Chairman Lasker estimated to be good ships, this same study declares:

"To achieve a balanced fleet then would involve the elimination of 3,000,000 gross tons (5,000,000 dead-weight tons) of cargo ships" (p. 40).

Upon the same subject, I call attention to the following extracts from the original statement of Chairman Lasker at the hearings (p. 7):

"Of our 6,000,000 tons of freighters, about half the steel tonnage is good tonnage—comparable to the best in the world. The other half ranges from fair to not usable for purposes and should be either sold abroad in such trades where we have every assurance it will not find itself in competition with our ships, or dismantled."

"Of the 6,000,000 tons of freighters the Government possesses it is the hope of the Shipping Board that ultimately a great measure of the 3,000,000 good tons will find itself in the hands of American owners, should the legislation here proposed be adopted. It is doubtful if, under the happiest conditions, the American flag will need the 3,000,000 good tons in its entirety, and ways and means must be found to dispose of such of the good tonnage as remains, so that American interests will not be hurt. Under no circumstances must the surplus good tonnage that America can not absorb be disposed of so as to bankrupt those who buy from the Government at current prices."

"Automatically the 3,000,000 poor tons must be done away with. Part of it can be used by selling to Americans the hulls at low figures for conversion to types of freighters of which we are not possessed. The balance may either be sold in small quantities in local trades abroad if any, where, because of shorter runs and cheaper labor, local operation may be possible, or it must largely be dismantled."

"It is the unneeded surplus, in ships as in all else, that determines the market, and the same circumstances that forced some farmers to burn their corn last winter demands that, at least so far as the uneconomical 3,000,000 tons of freighters go, we recognize that one of our problems is to force its disappearance from the market."

In further discussing the half of our tonnage which Chairman Lasker describes as from fair to useless, he says: "It is a very imprudent business man who fools himself on his assets. * * * Why should we swindle Americans by selling them ships that would only bankrupt them? It is unconscionable and the Government should not place itself in such a position" (p. 60).

Mr. Lasker correctly explains that 6,000,000 gross tons are equivalent to 10,000,000 dead-weight tons, and that ships are sold on a dead-weight ton basis. On cross-examination at the hearings he was questioned at length in regard to the value and anticipated sale price of our tonnage, and I quote from his testimony, as follows:

"Mr. LASKER. The world price on our good tonnage to-day is about \$30."

"Mr. HARDY. You mean that there is 10,000,000 tons that is worth \$30 a ton?"

"Mr. LASKER. There is 5,000,000 dead weight that is worth \$30 per ton if you can sell it. We have been willing to sell it at \$30 per ton for some months now, and we have been able to sell exactly 100,000 tons at that price (p. 27)."

"Mr. DAVIS. Now, Mr. Lasker, I assume that you and your associates have made some sort of estimate as to what you would hope to realize out of our fleet in the event this bill goes through?"

"Mr. LASKER. I have answered that at such length to the judge and to Mr. BRIGGS that I can not think of a new way to answer it."

"Mr. DAVIS. It was stated in the press some time ago, purporting to come from members of the Shipping Board, that \$200,000,000 was expected to be realized. Is that substantially correct?"

"Mr. LASKER. I would not stand back of that figure. I do not know. It is in the womb of the future. If you do not give us this legislation, you will never get this \$200,000,000; if you give us this legislation, you may get more. How much I don't know" (pp. 236-237).

"Mr. DAVIS. In other words, it would be 5,000,000 dead-weight tons, at \$30?"

"Mr. LASKER. Yes; that is it—well, wait; it would be 5,000,000, if \$30 is what we get."

"Mr. DAVIS. Have you any real hope of realizing more than that on the average?"

"Mr. LASKER. No; it is in the womb of the future. I don't want to be a prophet; I am no good at crystal gazing." (Hearings, 237.)

Neither Chairman Lasker nor any other representative of the Shipping Board could be persuaded to place any market value on the 5,000,000 dead-weight tons which they described as from fair to useless, nor would any of them make any estimate as to what they expected to realize upon this tonnage, even if the bill passed. However, in view of their pronounced policy of eliminating those ships by scrapping, dismantling, or otherwise disposing of them in such manner that they could not come in competition with the first-class tonnage and the other privately owned tonnage, it is quite evident that but a small amount could and would be realized upon same. It would certainly be a liberal estimate to say that same could thus be disposed of on an average of \$10 per dead-weight ton, which would net \$50,000,000. Assuming that the Shipping Board should be fortunate enough to sell this tonnage practically for junk at this price, and that they should sell all of the 5,000,000 dead-weight first-class tonnage at \$30, they would only receive \$200,000,000 for the total tonnage.

It appears clearly in the hearings that the hoped for price of \$30 per ton is dependent upon the passage of this bill and also improved world conditions. Chairman Lasker and other proponents of the bill state repeatedly that there is practically no sale for our ships now at any price. On the same occasion in which Mr. Lasker testified as to the value and sale price of the tonnage, he declared that "at the present time there is, by and large, no market for our vast tonnage" (p. 13).

And he further stated "we can not sell ships to-day at all" (p. 230). I also call attention to Mr. Lasker's testimony as to the intended sale of our ships appearing on pages 29 and 31 of the hearings.

W. J. Love, one of the \$35,000 experts and a vice president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, stated at the hearings that he thought that our ships ought to be put on the market and sold for whatever they would bring regardless of price, even though our ships might thus fall into the hands of one large combination, after which he was questioned, and testified as follows:

"Mr. BRIGGS. I am speaking about the price the Government can get for its fleet. Suppose the bids came in—if this bill should pass—and the bids made were of about the same character as those recently made for the fleet, and it was thought then that Congress intended that the fleet should be sold and put into the hands of private operators at the best price the board could get. They would have to sell it?"

"Mr. LOVE. Then you are going to end all the good that is done, because if you are going to hold it and sell it at the value established after the subsidy is made a law you are going to put into the hands of the private operators ships at a higher cost and put another burden on them."

"Mr. BRIGGS. You don't think that ought to be done?"

"Mr. LOVE. Let them sell the ships at the best price they can get for them now and start over like everybody else starts."

"Mr. BRIGGS. Well, it is generally conceded that nobody now wants ships. That is true, isn't it?"

"Mr. LOVE. That is true."

"Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Lasker has testified here that the bids they received were facetious. He regarded them as a joke."

"Mr. LOVE. That is true" (pp. 862-863).

H. H. Raymond, president of the American Steamship Owners' Association, after having stated that he did not think any ships could be sold now, was asked as to whether he would favor selling any of them until after the bill is passed, and he replied: "I would say emphatically that I would sell every darn ship that the Government has got as fast as I could and get the Government out of business" (pp. 987-988).

Similar views were expressed by other shipowners. As they have controlled the policies of the Shipping Board thus far, it may be reasonably presumed that they will do so in the future.

As a matter of fact, if this bill passes and the disposition of our fleet is left to the present Shipping Board I am convinced that it will not be sold for anything near as much as \$200,000,000. In fact, the Shipping Board has sold several 4,100-dead-weight-ton steamers of best quality for \$76,000 each, and have announced this as a fixed price for steamers of this type; that is, \$18.53 per ton.

Mr. Lasker does not deny that it is proposed to lend \$125,000,000 "to recondition the ships or build others." His comment on this is so utterly unfair and childish that it does not deserve notice.

As to the amount of the subsidies and aids provided in the bill, Chairman Lasker repeats the false statements, which he had iterated and reiterated, after having on cross-examination admitted the falsity of same; and he persists in resorting to the sophistry of discussing only the direct-voyage subsidies, as if that was all the burdens imposed by the bill. After considerable cross-examination, appearing on pages 239 to 242 and on pages 271 to 276 of the hearings, Mr. Lasker finally testified as follows:

"Mr. LASKER. Let me see, now, I think we can get a quick meeting of the minds."

"The total cost to the Treasury if the bill ever becomes highly successful in operating, so that we have an adequate merchant marine for peace and war, will be: Customs, \$30,000,000; tonnage, \$4,000,000; income tax, \$10,000,000; construction, \$3,000,000; and postage, \$5,000,000."

"Mr. DAVIS. How much does that add up—\$52,000,000?"

"Mr. LASKER. That will add up \$52,000,000."

This enumeration does not include certain indirect aids which Mr. Lasker was unable to estimate, although Mr. Lasker did say that the indirect aids were more valuable than the direct aids. Nor does it include the benefit to private shipowners by reason of elimination of the Army and Navy transport services, Mr. Lasker estimating that the net earnings to privately owned lines from this business in the Pacific alone would amount to approximately \$5,000,000. Nor does it include benefits to the shipowners which do not involve a burden upon the Public Treasury, such as the provision requiring one-half of the emigrants to come in American-flag ships, which Mr. Rosbottom estimated would give the American shipowners net profits of \$8,500,000 even under the present 3 per cent immigration law.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lasker was entirely too low in his estimates, and as the bill was indorsed by him and the President and as it passed the House it would involve a charge upon the Public Treasury of at least \$75,000,000 per year, or \$750,000,000 in 10 years, as has been fully shown in the minority report by Senator FLETCHER, by me, and others.

In keeping with his arrogant attitude, Chairman Lasker repeatedly refers to the fact that he and other representatives of the Shipping Board had testified at the hearings that the cost would be so-and-so, as if such assertions were conclusive and should not be questioned, when as a matter of fact such assertions were conclusively disproven upon the cross-examination of the same witnesses who asserted them, as well as by other facts.

Mr. Lasker begs the question by referring to amendments which were made in order to muster enough votes to jam the bill through the House or to report it out of the Commerce Committee. However, the amendment purporting to limit the voyage subsidies alone to \$30,000,000 per annum is wholly ineffective, as it is based upon the proposition that the Shipping Board "is satisfied that the amount payable in any fiscal year" * * * "will not exceed the sum of \$30,000,000." Besides, if it is not intended that the payment of voyage subsidies shall exceed \$30,000,000 per annum, why is it so strenuously insisted that there shall annually be paid into this subsidy fund 10 per cent of customs duties, which it is estimated will amount to \$45,000,000 under the present tariff law, and also tonnage taxes of over \$4,000,000 per annum, aggregating \$49,000,000, not to speak of the provision for refunds from subsidy recipients making over 10 per cent profits, upon which Mr. Lasker lays much stress, but which, I will frankly state, I consider of no consequence.

In his letter to you Chairman Lasker states that "the statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington-wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts." This characterization of the minority report is wholly and unqualifiedly false. Said report was originally filed June 28, 1922, and neither Mr. Lasker nor anybody else has answered or refuted a single statement contained therein. On June 13, last, I made a speech on this bill in the House in which I set forth the reasons for my opposition thereto, most of my speech being predicated upon testimony given by Chairman Lasker and other witnesses in behalf of the bill, and neither Mr. Lasker nor anybody else has as yet answered or refuted any portion of that speech.

I am opposed to this bill because I am opposed to subsidies in principle, but if I was in favor of subsidies I would be unalterably opposed to them being determined and dispensed by Albert D. Lasker; I would also be opposed to this bill because it is vicious and un-American in form, and because it involves an abdication by Congress and a usurpation of the rightful power of future Congresses. I am opposed to the bill because I am convinced that its passage and operation would be a hindrance, instead of a help, to a healthy, privately owned American merchant marine, although involving vast public expenditures. It is true that those of us who signed that minority report happen to be members of the minority party, members of the Democratic Party, which through its national platform has repeatedly declared against ship subsidies. However, the Republican Party in its national platform has never declared in favor of ship subsidies, even at times when efforts

were being made to put such bills through Congress. It is also true that 69 Republican Members of the House voted against this bill, and it is quite probable that at least that many more would have voted against the bill but for the pressure from the White House, or if the bill had been voted upon before the recent election.

Mr. Lasker purposely injected this charge of partisanship, because he knows that his infamous bill can not win upon its merits and that its only chance of passage through the Senate is as a partisan administration measure, as that was its only chance in the House.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lasker endeavored to work both sides of the street in a partisan way. While he was busily engaged in trying to line up Republican Members of Congress, he assigned to the members of the Shipping Board who had been appointed as Democrats the duty of lining up the Democratic Members, and said members of the Shipping Board, pursuant to such plans, addressed letters to the Democratic members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Representative HARDY of Texas and I in a reply to such letter (both letters appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1922), wrote in part:

"We readily concede that our merchant marine problem is of such transcendent importance that it should be solved upon merit and principle and not upon partisanship. However, with reference to the manner in which the matter has been handled, we wish to call your attention to certain facts of which you seem to be wholly oblivious. It is generally understood that Mr. Lasker was appointed chairman of the Shipping Board because of a very shrewd and valuable political service rendered during the last campaign; he certainly could not have been appointed because of any knowledge of shipping matters. His appointment, from a political standpoint, has been fully justified because he has demonstrated beyond question that he is a master politician. After months of laborious effort he has succeeded in committing the President to an elaborate and expensive ship subsidy program, a position never taken by a previous President. More than that, Mr. Lasker has enmeshed all the members of the Shipping Board in this program. This is especially significant in view of the fact that until now perhaps no high Government official in this country has openly and boldly advocated a ship subsidy since the emphatic rejection of such suggestions many years ago.

"Furthermore, Chairman Lasker, pursuant to the nonpartisan consideration for which you innocently vouch, invited the Republican members alone of the Merchant Marine Committee and the Commerce Committee to a dinner in his home, and after he had sumptuously fed them unfolded his ship subsidy program and undertook to commit them to it; and it has since been repeatedly announced in the press that Chairman Lasker has been in conference with the Republican members of said committees, that they had indorsed the ship-subsidy proposition in principle, and, later, that a bill had been agreed upon by Chairman Lasker, the President, and the Republican members of said committees. However, we predict that it will be demonstrated that Chairman Lasker misjudges some of the Republican members of said committees.

"Still further pursuing this nonpartisan course, a document of 268 pages, in which were assembled all the possible arguments in favor of ship-subsidy legislation, and particularly in favor of the bill which has since been introduced, was prepared and confidential copies thereof furnished to all the Republican members of the Merchant Marine Committee and Commerce Committee. It purported to have been prepared by the Bureau of Research of the United States Shipping Board at the instance of the latter. The undersigned, Mr. DAVIS, addressed a letter to the Shipping Board, requesting a copy of that document as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, stating that as it had been prepared by Government officials at Government expense he presumed that he was entitled to a copy thereof. He received a reply from Chairman Lasker, in which he advised that those copies had been completely exhausted. He further stated that it had been 'prepared at the request of the President and for him, and was furnished to him and to such persons as he directed.' This statement in spite of the fact that copies of said document had been furnished to all the Republican members of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, but to none of the Democratic members.

"Having, as he believes, successfully lined up the Republican members of said committees, Chairman Lasker has apparently assigned to you gentlemen the task of lining up the Democrats on said committees. However, you may tell Chairman Lasker that we are not as easily ensnared as some people he has come in contact with, and that we respectfully refuse to be 'bound and gagged' while he and the rest of you advocates of this iniquitous ship subsidy bill industriously disseminate your deceptive propaganda and lull the people and the Congress to sleep while you complete the job."

I take the liberty of addressing this letter to you in view of the fact that Chairman Lasker impersonated me in his letter to you, which he gave to the press and had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very sincerely,

EWIN L. DAVIS.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bursum	Dial	Glass
Ball	Cameron	Dillingham	Hale
Bayard	Capper	Elkins	Harris
Borah	Caraway	Fernald	Harrison
Brandeggee	Culberson	Fletcher	Heflin
Brookhart	Cummins	France	Hitchcock
Broussard	Curtis	Gerry	Johnson

Jones, N. Mex.	McCumber
Jones, Wash.	McKellar
Kellogg	McKinley
Kendrick	McNary
Keyes	Moses
King	Myers
Ladd	Nelson
La Follette	New
Lenroot	Nicholson
Lodge	Norbeck
McCormick	Norris

Oddie
Page
Pepper
Phipps
Pittman
Polindexter
Pomerene
Robinson
Sheppard
Shortridge
Smoot

Spencer
Stanfield
Stanley
Sterling
Sutherland
Townsend
Trammell
Warren
Watson
Weller

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very loath to take any time or to delay in any way one of the major appropriation bills; but the House has adopted at the close of the pending bill a provision requesting the President "to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of sub-surface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft." The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has proposed an amendment extending that request so as to cover land armament, and also inserting an entirely new subject, requesting and authorizing the President to call a conference for the purpose of considering economic problems.

The provision of the House bill and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho open questions of such grave importance that I do not feel willing to allow them to pass wholly without comment. They propose to request the President and to authorize him to take certain action in entering into negotiations with foreign powers. Under our Constitution and our system of government the conduct of our relations with other nations is under the control of the President of the United States. The President must conduct all such negotiations, and he carries the great responsibility of our foreign relations. It could not be otherwise, either constitutionally or practically; for a legislative body is, to all intents and purposes, incapable of conducting negotiations.

There are several instances in our history where the President has consulted the Senate in regard to negotiations or as to entering upon negotiations, and there are other instances on the other side where the Senate has expressed to the President its opinion as to entering upon negotiations or as to their purpose and conduct. There can be no doubt of the right of the President so to consult the Senate or of the Senate so to advise the President; but, of course, the final power in regard to negotiations rests and must rest with the President. The President is not bound by any action or any advice we may offer in regard to negotiations any more than is the Senate bound, when a treaty comes within its jurisdiction, to accept the advice of the President. At the same time, almost any President would give great weight to the advice of the Senate, which shares with him the treaty-making power, in regard to negotiations. Therefore the advice we offer should be most carefully considered.

To inaugurate such a conference as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho is not at all like summoning a conference to consider the question of coal or unemployment or railroads; those are matters of vast importance to the people of the United States, but they are wholly domestic and are within our own control. When, however, we undertake to advise the President as to his duties as the representative of the United States in charge of our foreign relations, the matter assumes a much graver complexion. That is especially true when we advise the President to invite a conference of the powers. When the United States invites other nations to meet here in a conference it assumes a serious responsibility. We have the same right that every other power represented has to put our veto on any proposition which may be made, but it is not a little difficult for us to do so when we are in the attitude of a host. Therefore it is of the utmost importance when we urge the President to invite other powers to a conference that we make very explicit exactly what that conference is expected to do.

The first proposition suggested by the House provision and by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho relates to disarmament; that is, to extending limitations to surface, subsurface, and auxiliary craft of navies generally. It seems to me that it is well very briefly to call the attention of the Senate to just what has been done. It is now barely a year since the President, with the approbation of Congress and the general approbation of the country, called a conference here for the purpose of considering the question of disarmament, or I should say, to be more exact, the limitation of armament. It was not confined to the limitation of naval armament alone; it covered also land

armament, as does the proposed amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Let me deal with the question of land armament first. It was the first subject dealt with by the conference. It was taken up at the third plenary session on the 21st of November, 1921; and, I think, we all must remember the speech then made by M. Briand, the prime minister of France at the time, on the question of the limitation of land armament. It was a speech of great force and great eloquence. He stated the position of France, and that they could not consent to any limitation of land armament in the present condition of affairs in Europe. That, of course, put an end to any further action by the conference on the question of land armament, for no action could be taken except by unanimous agreement. As a matter of fact, the United States had reduced its land armament to something less than a proper peace basis, and Great Britain had also reduced to a similar but sufficient basis her land armament; but the refusal of France, in which, as I recall, she had the sympathy of Japan, of course, put an end, as I have said, to any further consideration of the limitation of land armament.

France may have changed her attitude in that respect within the year, but if she has I have had no information to that effect. Of course, the Senator from Idaho may have information that France has altered her opinion; but, in any event, it would be useless to call a conference for the limitation of land armament without knowing as a preliminary step that France was ready to withdraw her objection and ready to consider with the other powers the limitation of her land forces. It would be futile to call a conference for the reduction of land armament unless it were known beforehand that those powers that were summoned were not going to object at the very beginning to any consideration of that point.

Now, as to surface and subsurface boats and the other auxiliary craft the limitation of which both the House and the Senator from Idaho desire to have a further conference to consider, when the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, opened the Washington conference, after stating in detail the proposition for the limitation of capital ships, he said:

The plan includes provision for the limitation of auxiliary combatant craft. This term embraces three classes; that is: (1) auxiliary surface combatant craft, such as cruisers (exclusive of battle cruisers), flotilla leaders, destroyers, and various surface types; (2) submarines; and (3) airplane carriers.

In the appendix which is printed with his address the plan is given in detail, and will be found on page 60 of the report of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, under the head of "Auxiliary combatant craft," and it begins:

In treating this subject auxiliary combatant craft have been divided into three classes:

- (a) Auxiliary surface combatant craft.
- (b) Submarines.
- (c) Airplane carriers and aircraft.

Then follow propositions of limitation of the tonnage of such craft by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan; limitation of new construction, and scrapping of old construction; the limitation of submarines, of new construction, and the scrapping of old construction; the limitation of airplane carriers and aircraft, with the limitation of new construction and scrapping of old construction. Then come replacements, aircraft, and clauses relating to the merchant marine. In other words, the American delegation, the representatives of the United States, presented through Mr. Hughes to the conference a complete plan for the limitation of all the various kinds of auxiliary craft which are covered by the House provision and by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

The matter was taken up in the committee of the conference charged with the question of naval disarmament, and was discussed at great length. I need not go into all the details of it. The French were opposed to the propositions as to capital ships, to which, however, they ultimately assented; but as to auxiliary craft, I read simply a passage from the telegraphic letter of M. Briand to Mr. Hughes on December 16, in which he says:

But so far as the defensive ships are concerned—light cruisers, torpedo boats, and submarines—it would be impossible for the French Government, without putting itself in contradiction with the vote of the chambers, to accept reductions corresponding to those which we accept for capital ships under this formal reserve, which you will certainly understand.

I have marked here the different statements that were made in the course of the debate, which it is not necessary to take the time of the Senate to read; but I can state the matter very briefly.

To take submarines first, Great Britain proposed that the conference should agree to the complete suppression of submarines—to their abolition. To that, I think, all the members of the conference objected, and it proceeded no further. The United States then made a proposition for the limitation of

submarines. We had at that time something over 80,000 tons, a larger submarine tonnage than any other power. We proposed to put on a limitation of 60,000 tons. France declined the limitation, and so, as I remember, did Japan, although after one declination no more was needed; but Holland, one of the smaller powers, also made strong objection to any limitation of submarine tonnage.

It is not necessary to go into the reasons of the different powers for this action; but the objection was an absolute one, and that made it impossible for the conference to effect any limitation of the submarines or the auxiliary craft except the general limitations put on as to the caliber of guns on vessels of less than 10,000 tons. That was a very important limitation, because it prevented competition in what is really the dominant element in a navy. Therefore no limitation was placed on auxiliary craft. The conference was unable to do it, owing to the refusal of France and other powers.

The naval treaty has been ratified by Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. It has not yet been ratified by France and Italy, the other two signers of the naval treaty. I hope and believe, and I have every reason to believe, that France will ratify the treaties of Washington within a very short time; but we have received no information, so far as I am aware, from France, from Holland, from Japan; or from Italy, that they are ready to meet us in conference and place limitations upon submarines and auxiliary craft. As in the case of land armament, it would be perfectly idle to take the great responsibility of calling a conference to consider limitations which were rejected only a year ago unless we had assurance from the powers invited that they were ready to consider the question of limitations for surface and subsurface and for auxiliary craft generally. It might not do any harm, except to put us in the rather absurd position of asking for a conference to consider limitations of armament which we knew beforehand would be refused, but it certainly could do no good. I have cordially supported, myself, the limitations which were made and we went as far as we could go, and I thought them a great step in advance; but it seems to me there is nothing to be gained until we are informed and until Congress is informed by those charged with our foreign relations that the time has come when we can have a conference which will be effective in further limitations applied to submarines and other auxiliary craft.

I know very well what the evidences of competition are to which the Senator from Idaho referred the other day. I know that the powers are building aircraft carriers and cruisers, as they have a right to do under the existing treaty of Washington. So far as the United States is concerned, we ought to build those light cruisers, and we ought above all to build the airplane carriers, whether a limitation is to be put upon them or not, because, though the Navy of the United States was very powerful in capital ships, in destroyers, in submarines, it was not well balanced. We had practically only one or two light cruisers. We had 10 authorized, vessels of 75,000 tons burden, and we need those light, unarmored cruisers very much. Some of them are under construction now. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] can tell the Senate just what their state of advancement is. They are absolutely needed. We ought to have them.

We have no airplane carriers. It is recognized, I think, by everyone, that the forces of the air will play a very great part in future naval warfare. Airplane carriers are necessary to accompany the fleet for the purpose, as their name implies, of carrying airplanes.

Without having looked into it with any minuteness, I think we are altogether too weak in regard to airplanes themselves; and although I most cordially supported the limitations of the treaties and believed, as I have said, that they constituted a very great step toward relieving the people from tax burdens and securing the peace of the world, I am not one of those who think that the time has come when we should have no navy or reduce it to a mere handful of ships.

It has been the characteristic of the American people, after they have had a war, to conclude that there never would be another. After the Civil War we proceeded practically to destroy our Navy, and in a comparatively few years we had no navy left. Then, at great expense, we went to work and slowly built it up. The performances of our new Navy in the Spanish War were such that the people generally were very ready to uphold it and we went on building a navy, with some stumblings and hesitations and not on a comprehensive plan; but still we went on building ships, and we all know what the history of our Navy was when the Great War broke upon us. I hope there never will be another war. I do not believe there is a man or a woman living who hates the thought of war more

keenly than I do; but the Navy and the Army are still necessary implements of national protection and defense.

No matter what treaties are made, we must have some means of protecting our commerce and our citizens abroad and our own territory and our citizens at home. I have had no sympathy with the extremes to which the House has gone, I was about to say not in the destruction of the Army but in reducing it to a point which is so low as to be positively perilous. It so happened that in 1919 the capital city of my State was for 24 hours left without a police force, which in its essence is a military force for the protection of a given locality. No one who is familiar with what then happened, I think, will ever recover from the lesson, which showed that it was not the body of men whom we see managing traffic, preserving order in the streets, arresting criminals, and so forth, but it was the fact of the existence of the force on which the safety of a great city depended. In those few unguarded hours there broke out from the darkness and from hidden places criminals and marauders. They suddenly appeared. Shops were broken into and sacked, lives were endangered and some lost, and the great city was at the mercy of those forces which are hidden from sight while we all live in the sunlight of well-protected streets and houses, and then in a flash people found the danger which was close to them. Among human beings there was an element which simply desired to rob, plunder, and destroy. Massachusetts was fortunate in her governor, who now presides over this Senate, and who, by his vigor, determination, and calmness, was able to face that crisis, and who happily was aided by a police commissioner who was a man of great courage, force, and readiness. The result of the governor's action was that the peril was over in 24 hours. The troops of the State were brought in, most of them men who had just come back from service in the Great War, and order reigned when those men appeared. But, Mr. President, those who saw and knew what happened in that one night realize the necessity of organized police or military protection if the fabric of society is to be at all maintained and anarchy and pillage are not to prevail.

What is true of the necessity of the maintenance of a police force in all our States and cities is equally true of this troubled world. No man can tell when some reckless, desperate power, perhaps a small one, may suddenly make an attack upon American citizens in foreign lands. In such emergencies it is necessary for every nation which undertakes to protect its citizens in every corner of the earth, as every great nation should, to have ships and troops, and not be obliged to wait for days and weeks, and perhaps months, before they can raise them. It is not a question of war making; it is a question of ordinary protection and safety, and under whatever arrangements we may make there is a limitation of reduction which ought always to be observed. It is not only not economy, it is the most reckless extravagance, to reduce the Army and the Navy of the United States to a point where we have no means of performing the duties which every great nation is obliged to perform.

I am not saying that, Mr. President, because I am opposed to a further limitation applied to auxiliary craft. I did my best personally only a year ago to secure those limitations. I should be glad to see them made now. But there is something that is not good like a limitation, something that is very dangerous, and that is when, without regard to national safety, we proceed in a false spirit of economy to enter on the road of abolishing or destroying our Army or our Navy.

I hope we can bring about a further limitation of auxiliary craft, just as I hope we shall keep our Navy, limited as it now is, at a point of high efficiency, and that we shall not allow it to go limping along without proper provisions for surface and subsurface craft and air defense. We have two great half-finished battleships, which were provided for in the treaty, which can be made into airplane carriers at once, and that ought to be done. We ought also to build up our airplane force.

Mr. President, I am aware I have strayed a little from the chief point I wanted to make, which is that desiring as I do to extend the limitations of a year ago, then confined to capital ships—I am putting aside for the moment the limitations which were put on gun calibers, which were equally important—I want to see those limitations extended to the auxiliary craft. I have told the Senate what the Senate and the House both should remember, that just about a year ago several of the powers assembled in Washington refused to agree to any limitations of the smaller craft, and until we can receive assurances that they are ready to proceed with those limitations and the limitation of land armaments, I confess I see nothing to be gained by our issuing an invitation which we know would either not be accepted or, if accepted, would be fruitless.

Mr. President, now I come to the very important proposition, not at all considered by the House, embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]; that is, a proposition for an economic conference. That, of course, is wholly new. In my judgment it is subject to the point of order; but I am not going to argue the point of order this morning. It no doubt will be made at the proper time. I am quite aware that the House in its clause put in general legislation in disregard of their rules, and when it came here it was in order because it came from the House, and I know very well the rulings made by Vice President Marshall in regard to the right which such action by the House conveyed to the Senate to amend general legislation and extend it if it was put in by the House. But this proposition for an economic conference is entirely new. It has no relation to the general legislation proposed by the House, and its importance is very great indeed.

Of course, we are all anxious to do everything we properly can do to restore business stability to Europe and to aid Europe in that direction in any reasonable way we can. Selfishness alone would be a sufficient reason for that, because the restoration of Europe to stability would tend to widen our markets and increase our commerce. Also, the American people feel a deep sympathy and also a very deep indignation against some of the cruel massacres perpetrated by the Turks which have disfigured Asia Minor and which have made the taking of Smyrna forever infamous. Everyone with any human sympathies at all must be anxious to have the United States do all it can to aid Europe in the situation which exists.

This amendment of the Senator from Idaho provides for "a conference which shall be charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions." That is very broadly drawn. It has no boundaries. It extends, or can be extended, from the heavens above to the earth beneath.

It seems to me, Mr. President, if we are to consider it at all with a view of action here—and it is very important action to express the opinion of the Senate on a matter involving our foreign relations—that we ought to know before we do it exactly what the powers of the conference are to be and just what the amendment means. As the amendment is worded, there is nothing to prevent such a conference, if called and assembled, from considering the question of the foreign debts due to the United States. It is true that consideration of those debts is now provided for by an act of Congress, but a treaty, if ratified, would override the act of Congress, just as an act of Congress could abrogate a clause in a treaty if made subsequently.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I asked a question?

Mr. LODGE. Not the slightest.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to say that if the treaty were agreed to, of course it would override the act of Congress.

Mr. LODGE. I meant ratified, of course.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator does not contend that the Congress itself may do anything toward canceling the debt until it is reported back to the Congress?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. The treaty would have to be ratified of course. But we summon the conference and we ought to tell the nations invited, if we do summon such a conference, exactly what we mean to object to and what we mean to consider. The fact of the invitation is a very serious matter. It is only just, when we are inviting a conference of this sort, that we should say just what we mean. I do not know what the feeling of Congress would be as to permitting a general economic conference to pass upon the foreign debts due to us, but it seems to me that is a question which should be excluded. I think the debts due to the United States should be considered and dealt with by the United States alone. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the people of the United States to deal with those debts otherwise than generously and fairly, but I do not think they would care to have the fate of those debts settled by other powers.

Under the conference of course we should be called upon to take part in the Reparation Commission. We are seeking no reparations, but we should be called upon to take part in it and enter to that extent at least into a revision, perhaps, of the treaty of Versailles. I think, whatever we feel about that, that we should determine and make clear in our legislation just what our opinion is and how far we should go. Such a conference, if it should ever come into existence, would undoubtedly have the power to consider advancing large sums of new money to help

Germany or to help France. I do not know how far the Senate thinks it should commit itself to the policy of advancing money from the Treasury of the United States for the reestablishment of the finances of Germany or France, but it seems to me that if we are to do it, if we are to enter into a conference where that question would surely arise, there ought to be some distinct statement as to our attitude in regard to it.

There are many other things involved. If we are to enter upon the business of restoring stability in Europe, of course we shall be called upon not only to help France, Italy, and Germany but the Austrian States of the former empire, the Balkans, Asia Minor, and, I suppose, Russia. I am not arguing now the merits of those varying propositions. I am merely suggesting that before we pass resolutions or adopt amendments favoring an economic conference we should know how far we are going and what we propose to do. It is easy enough to say "Let us have an economic conference," but when nations come together in an economic conference the case assumes immense importance and seriousness. There is one thing we should never permit, and that is to invite all the nations to meet us and have any misunderstanding about our attitude before we go into the conference. We must know exactly what we are ready to consider and what we will not consider.

Of course there are many other questions that might be brought up in the conference upon which I hope, before the debate ends and before final action is taken, the Senate will express its opinion. The question of immigration, for example, could not, in my opinion, be kept out of that conference under its very terms. I for one should not be willing to have that question go before the conference at all. I do not suppose that the conference would take up any purely political questions, but when anything is as large and broad as the conference proposed in this amendment no one can tell where it will end.

All I am asking to-day is that the Senate shall consider the matter with the utmost care before the amendment is agreed to. We are taking upon ourselves the duty of expressing the opinion of the United States Senate. We are undertaking to advise the President, who is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, to take a very grave step. We do not know what he has done in these various directions. We do know that he is as desirous as anybody possibly can be to improve economic conditions in Europe and to aid those countries toward greater business stability. But what steps he may have taken we do not know. It will be no one's wish, I am sure, to embarrass him in the conversations or negotiations or the efforts which he may now be making, and which he is now making as a matter of fact. For that reason, as well as for the others I have mentioned, we ought to set forth very carefully exactly what we mean in the amendment if we are to accept it at all.

My own belief is as a general proposition that the United States can be of greater service to humanity and to its fellow nations in Europe and elsewhere by holding itself free from obligations which would bind it to action which it might not be willing to take when the hour for action came. The United States without treaty obligations of any kind rendered a very great service to the world. We asked nothing; we received nothing. We took not one inch of land nor have we sought a dollar of reparation. I am very proud to think that that is the record of my country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just stated that if the amendment were to be adopted we should set forth with particularity what was to be included within the jurisdiction of the conference.

Mr. LODGE. Or what was to be excluded.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator to particularize and state what he thinks could be considered with propriety and what could not be thus considered?

Mr. LODGE. I have confined myself to stating the things that I thought should be excluded or should be certainly defined. What precisely we can do in an economic conference in directions we should be willing to accept I am not yet able to say. I think we can be of service as we have been of service, but what we can do precisely at an economic conference, unless possibly as an arbitrator or mediator, I am not able to define.

In conclusion may I repeat that we have taken no foot of land and no dollar of reparations, and I am very proud to think that is our record. I have not a word of reflection upon the other countries who suffered and sacrificed so much in the war, but they have already received large and important advantages from the conclusion of the war. I do not grudge them anything they have received. I do not question the justice of

it. But they have all received something of very great material value—immense territories in Africa, territories in Asia Minor, islands in the Pacific, and the rest. They have rid themselves for some years of the competition of the German merchant marine. Those things are all of great pecuniary value and, as I said, I do not grudge them anything. But we have asked nothing, we want nothing, we have taken nothing, and we do not propose to do so. I think that that fact alone should leave it to us to determine if we are to give, what we shall give, when we shall give, and where we shall give, and not permit it settled for us by other nations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I share the pride which the Senator from Massachusetts takes in the fact that we have not demanded nor have we obtained one inch of territory or one dollar of reparation or of indemnity from Germany, but I wish it to be remembered that that fact, redounding much to our praise, was a fact which originated in the mind and was carried out in the conduct of Woodrow Wilson, then President of these United States; and that whatever cruelty may have been visited upon him while he came very near dying in the line of duty, that praise at least must be given him, that, sitting around the council table at Versailles, the very first thing that he announced to the world was that America wanted nothing out of the war except winning the war and making the world safe for democracy so far as the war had done it, overcoming autocracy and overwhelming German junkerism. That was Woodrow Wilson before the time when, falling like a soldier in the line of battle, he fell heavily wounded; and he is heavily wounded yet; and I hope that nobody will attempt to take from him the praise of the initiative and the inauguration of that purely unselfish American policy.

Mr. President, after the World War was over a few things occurred and a few things are now occurring that do not meet with my approbation, although my approbation or disapprobation amounts to very little, for I am just about ready to leave this august scene and to take my refuge with the birds and my books and my grandchildren. There are, however, some things that I do not like. I do not like to see America standing idle to-day while the Turks are deporting Armenian grandfathers and grandchildren, killing men of military age wherever they can reach them, and ravishing Armenian women all the time. I have been ever a peace lover and opposed to war, but there are some things that do arouse my warlike instinct. If I were of this administration, instead of being merely an outgoing Senator, if I stood in Harding's place to-morrow, I would send instructions to Child and the others representing us at Lausanne to give the "unspeakable Turk" an ultimatum that no more Christians must be deported, no more Christians murdered, no more Christian women ravished in Asia Minor; and that if it were not possible to find a home for them somewhere in Asia, where they could be protected, a home should be found for them in eastern Thrace; and that these United States—God bless them—would stand with all their power and their resources and their ideals and their traditions behind the idea that unspeakable outrages perpetrated by the present Turkish Government shall cease, or, if they shall not cease, that then these resources and these ideals and these traditions shall come into the combat upon the side of humanity and upon the side of Christianity.

I hesitate a little to say "Christianity," because I know that in the bottom of your hearts most of you do not believe in it at all except in a perfunctory church way; but there is a Christianity which proceeds from the philosophy of Jesus, and that Christianity consists in making of ourselves our brother's keeper. I have no patience at all with the utterance of Cain and the utterance of so-called modern American progressives after Cain, when they say, "We are not our brother's keeper."

Mr. President, we are our brother's keeper, and if we were as selfish as a dog who loves nothing except his master, as men and women we are still and must still be by the very necessity of the situation our brother's keeper. To undertake to isolate these United States—48 of them, each one of them an empire in itself almost—from the common life and community ideals and the rich traditions of civilization and of Christianity is the maddest and the most selfish thing that anybody ever attempted to do since this world began.

Mr. President, there lives on S Street in this city now a man who is a private citizen. For a time he cut a wide swath in the history of the world; for a time he was worshiped by nearly everybody outside of his own country; and "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country." Crippled in the war struggle, no pity shown for him here, no sympathy ever uttered on the other side of the Chamber that I remember, not even one word from anybody, and yet the Senator from Massachusetts this morning can point with pride to only one thing—and that was not the policy of the Senator from Massachusetts nor

the policy of this Chamber, on either side, but it was Woodrow Wilson's policy—that was that America should be represented in a great congress of the great nations of the world, and very nearly all the nations of the world, and should say, through her Chief Executive's lips, "We want nothing, not one inch of land, not a dollar of reparation nor indemnity; we are satisfied, provided only we can put an end to war and put an end to the causes of war, so far as that is possible."

He came back from there and brought the Versailles treaty with him. There were many things in it which I did not like; there are many things that the people did not like; but it contained the great central idea that was uttered by a British battalion when they were charging successfully a nest of German guns: "Never again! Never again! Never again!" They destroyed the German nest; they won a glorious victory; but the victory was not in destroying the German nest; it was in the utterance that those atrocious, contemptible, inhuman, uncivilized conditions of actual warfare in the air and on the earth and in the waters beneath the earth should never be revisited upon this world again if they could prevent it; and they uttered to God the words that they were dying that day to prevent it if they could. So far as I know, that was the only battalion that ever uttered that slogan of warfare out loud, but they were not the only battalion that carried that slogan of warfare in their hearts across the trenches and into no man's land.

Let me speak an almost parting word to you, for it will not be long before I leave you, and God knows I never intend to bother you after I leave you or to be bothered by you. [Laughter.] That almost parting word is this: America is a part of this earth; her traditions, her ideals, her magnificent unselfishness are a part of the present status of this earth; and I do not care what you say nor what you do nor how you vote, you can not get rid of that fact. We are not only a part of it but a magna pars; we are a great part of it; I might go further and say that we are the greatest part of it. Is there a man here listening to me to-day who imagines that the condition at Lausanne and in Asia Minor could have taken place or would have taken place if America or rather these United States—for we are only a part of America—had been members of the League of Nations with the will and with the power to make the league count? And yet, gentlemen every day seem to take pride in the fact that the league has not counted for much. It has counted for more than they say, but it has not counted to the full. Why? Because you took off its right arm; you left it fightless; you left it almost ambitionless; but if you think that the common sense and the common conscience of the common people of America have been stupefied and annihilated by what you did you are mistaken. Long after I have gone out of public life, perhaps after some of you have died an actual death, there will be the common sense and the common conscience of the common people of America behind the idea of preserving and enforcing—mark you, enforcing—the peace of the world, and behind that, too, enforcing industrial peace and other forms of peace on this earth.

Christ was not born for nothing and did not live for nothing and did not die for nothing and did not preach for nothing. When He announced the doctrine of the common fatherhood of God and the common brotherhood of man He meant what He said, and that idea sank into our hearts. I do not care how weak we are nor how sinful we are—and God knows I am one of the weakest and one of the most sinful—the idea is there, and no politics, no finesse, no private meetings of Senators or of Representatives can ever overwhelm it.

It stands like the church of God, secure against the gates of hell. You can not help it. You may delay the coming of the time. You may think you are awfully smart when you advise the American people to take care of their own interests and to let their brethren in Europe go to hell. You may think all that; but you are not awfully smart when you say it, and you are not awfully good when you say it. You are just common, selfish, mean men, and sometime you will be swept away like playing cards upon the surface of a bowl of water which has overflowed; and the overflow will mean that America once more will step into her own on the surface of this earth, and that we will allow no more Armenian women to be ravished, no more Armenian grandfathers and grandchildren to be deported, and we will not allow the unspeakable Turk a place in Europe at all. If we had been members of the league, there would have been no question of it. No matter if Great Britain and France for selfish reasons, commercial or otherwise, had been willing to compromise, American idealism would not have been willing to compromise.

Why, Mr. President, I was reading in the last Literary Digest, which perhaps most of you have read, an account of what was happening to the Greeks and to the Armenians. Some of the

things are unspeakable. Some of them are not to be mentioned before women, some of whom are in the gallery; and we—we, the people of the land of Washington and Jefferson and Henry Clay and Lincoln—are standing by, are holding our hands folded, and we are saying to the entire world, much to the encouragement of Germany and Russia and Turkey and Bulgaria, that we have nothing to do with it; that we are outside of the family; we rather doubt whether we are kin to the family or not. There may be a common fatherhood of God, but it does not cover them and us both. It covers them, maybe, or it covers us, maybe, but it can not cover us both. We can not live in the same tent; we do not intend to have anything to do with the same tent; and wise men in their imaginations, who think they are ultra progressive, tell us all that!

Do you know what real progressivism means? It means taking steps forward toward the concept of God and trying to idealize our ordinary relations toward a common goal, which is His will, and His will is for peace on earth amongst men. That is what real progressivism means; but I doubt not that to a lot of you it looks like conservatism and reaction of the most ultimate character—going back to God, which is rather, I imagine, a reactionary movement.

I indorse what the Senator from Massachusetts said in so far as I have dwelt upon what he said. It was a little peculiar, though, that he could say it, that even with his ingenuity he could say it, without mentioning the name of Woodrow Wilson, fallen soldier by the wayside. I got up merely to strain that point, and nothing else much.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I disagree with the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to the relationship which the Congress sustains to the President of the United States with reference to foreign affairs. I think the Congress may properly and constitutionally exercise much more power with reference to foreign affairs than it has assumed to exercise heretofore within the last few years. I understand, of course, that with the President lies, technically speaking, the act of negotiation; but we also have at all times not only the right but in my humble opinion the duty not only to consent but to advise. It certainly can not be out of place for the Congress—for the Senate particularly—to express itself with reference to a matter which not only appertains to foreign affairs, but which, by reason of its peculiar nature, essentially enters into our domestic affairs.

I do not think, however, that it is necessary to go into a technical discussion as to the powers of the President and the Senate, respectively, upon this subject, for it must be conceded that the amendment which I propose to offer is well within any number of precedents which might be cited.

The Senator calls attention to the fact that this amendment is very broad, and he is of the opinion that if we are going to pass a measure dealing with the subject we should be specific as to what we propose to do. If I may be permitted to say so, that would come closer to encroaching upon the power of the President as a negotiator than anything which has been suggested in the amendment. The amendment provides for the calling of an economic conference as well as a disarmament conference, and I think it will be conceded that until negotiations or satisfactory communications have been had with the foreign powers it would be very difficult to determine in detail the specific matters which would be dealt with under that kind of a call.

We passed a resolution with reference to a disarmament conference; and the President, as he had a perfect right to do, assumed to enlarge the program of the conference, and did so after communicating with the other nations. I take it that unless the President should advise us at this time as to the negotiations which are now going on and the extent to which they have progressed and the subject matters about which he is of the opinion that we may properly confer, it would be improper for us to undertake to designate specifically what particular subjects should be up for consideration at this conference.

I am perfectly willing—and I should suppose that the Senator from Massachusetts would be perfectly willing—to leave this matter where it properly belongs, and that is, with the Chief Executive, after he has communicated with the other powers as to the specific subjects which should be covered. The resolution was not drawn in this way inadvisedly or without due consideration. It was drawn for the very purpose of not embarrassing or curtailing, if he should see fit to observe our suggestion, the powers of the President to fix the program which he thought would be most effective in dealing with the subject. If, however, the Senator from Massachusetts or other Senators are sufficiently advised as to the Executive's views as to include those things which ought to be included, in their opinion, and to exclude those which ought to be excluded, I

should be pleased to consider the suggestions which they have to make.

This is not in all essentials a purely foreign question—that is to say, a question which relates alone to foreign affairs. It has progressed to the point where the subject matter of the conference affects our legislation here relative to domestic affairs, and it has progressed to the point where it concerns every business man and every farmer and every laboring man and practically every home in the United States. It is a matter about which we are compelled to think and with regard to which we must reflect in dealing with the multitude of things which we have to deal with and which are conceded to be peculiarly within the province of the Congress.

The Senator advises us that the President, as he knows, is now negotiating in regard to this matter. I am, of course, pleased to be advised of that in a way which would be considered as authoritative, but I had supposed that the President was thinking over the matter. I had no right to assume that he had yet taken up negotiations; but it is a matter which everyone must consider, and one with which we must all deal. It is interesting, however, to know that negotiations are now in progress dealing with the specific subject with which we are now concerned here as a Senate; and if we can be advised that the action of the United States Senate in approving of the dealing with these subjects will conflict with or embarrass the program which is now under way I shall be very glad indeed also to consider that in the disposition of the matter. I have a perfectly open mind as to how we shall deal with this subject matter. My mind is closed as to the proposition that we must deal with it. As to the method and the manner of treating the subject, it is one about which I should, of course, be glad to take suggestions in advance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Did the Senator understand the Senator from Massachusetts to state that the President had been negotiating with reference to further disarmament or only as to the economic situation?

Mr. BORAH. I understood he referred only to the economic situation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I supposed.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I had in mind, and it was to that I was addressing my attention at this time.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator hold that his amendment confers upon the President any power he does not now possess?

Mr. BORAH. I do not. The President has a perfect right to initiate these negotiations without this authority. It would be considered a part of his treaty-making power and also within his right as the Chief Executive. It has always been the contention of the executive department that the recent disarmament conference was initiated without any regard to the resolution which was passed by Congress. President Roosevelt initiated three separate movements for an international conference without any consideration previously by Congress. But there is very much to be gained, in my opinion, by a consideration of this matter at the hands of Congress and by the expression upon the part of Congress as to the necessity of the movement. The President could utterly disregard this amendment if he thought it was not wise to accept it, or he could, within the limits of the amendment, confine it to such subject matters as he thought were expedient to be dealt with. But if he is going forward, nothing could be more helpful than to be supported by the Congress.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator remember the provision of the deficiency appropriation act of 1913 prohibiting the President from calling any conference, or issuing invitations to foreign powers to hold a conference, except with the approval of Congress?

Mr. BORAH. I do not recall its terms and it has been very greatly respected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] looked at that provision this morning and has it fresher in mind than I have, and if he has it before him I will ask him to read it, if the Senator from Idaho will allow it to be read.

Mr. BORAH. I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. LENROOT. This is a provision in the deficiency appropriation act of 1913, Sixty-second Congress. It reads as follows:

Hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international conference or like event without first having specific authority of law to do so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had not lately looked up that proposition, and I am glad it has been called to my attention. It makes all the more essential the adoption of this amendment, if the President is to deal with this matter effectively, and by the way of a conference. I doubt very much if that provision of the law would stand the test; but, assuming that it would stand the test, it is all the more necessary that the Congress of the United States approve of the program before the President acts. This would be true, however, that notwithstanding the fact that the President of the United States were authorized by this, he would not be compelled to regard the amendment if he thought it was unwise.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Just there I call the Senator's attention to the fact that his amendment not only authorizes the President to do it but it requests him to do it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, so did the disarmament resolution authorize and request him to call a conference, but it has been stated time and time again authoritatively that he did not call the disarmament conference as a result of that resolution. It originated in another way, we are told, and it was not the disarmament conference for which the resolution provided. It included subject matters which the resolution did not cover. It included countries which the resolution did not cover, and it included subject matters which even disarmament did not cover. Therefore I take it that it will not be argued here as a technical proposition that because we adopt this amendment the President will be compelled to adhere to the suggestion.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think that if Congress shall adopt the amendment in the form in which he proposes it it will be an expression upon the part of Congress that there should be such an economic conference without limitation or condition?

Mr. BORAH. It would be an expression upon the part of Congress that there should be such a conference.

Mr. LENROOT. Without limitation or condition?

Mr. BORAH. No; not necessarily without limitation, because the power rests with the President to fix the limits.

Mr. LENROOT. The power rests in him, but when we ask the President to call an economic conference for a certain purpose there is no limitation or condition implied, it seems to me.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I want the amendment to be so broad that the President of the United States will not be justified in saying, and could not sincerely say, that the amendment was such that he could not operate under it. If we undertook to say that it should be confined to reparations alone, the President would at once say, "In my opinion, it would be impossible to consider that subject without considering other matters in connection with it." If we confine it to this or that subject, and the negotiators, or those who are to be invited, suggest other subjects, the matter stops at once, so far as our negotiations are concerned, if we are confined to the amendment. If you give the President no breadth, no width, no discretion, you are in effect limiting his power to deal effectively with the subject.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator's view seems to be that the President should be left free to call up for consideration any question he sees fit to call up. Of course, any right the President can claim can be claimed by the representative of any foreign country the moment he takes his seat at this board. Is not that the Senator's view?

Mr. BORAH. That is correct.

Mr. REED of Missouri. So that when this conference is called, aided by the action of this body, we are calling a conference to consider any European question or Asiatic question or African question which may be brought before the conference.

Mr. BORAH. If the amendment is taken as it expresses itself, the conference would have to be confined to economic problems.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, yes; but the Senator agrees that they are not limited to that. The Senator is too fair and too broad a man to deny for a moment that it is easy enough to find that almost any conceivable question on earth is related in some way to the economic situation of the world and to the naval and military establishments of the world. So, if we call this conference, let us do it with our eyes open to the fact that there is no question on this earth which may not come up there for discussion, particularly unless we insist that the President in calling the conference shall expressly limit the

subject matter. Is not that about where we come out? I do not want to debate it; I want to get the Senator's view.

Mr. BORAH. I am very willing to debate it with the Senator or with anyone else, because if I am in error as to the terms of the amendment I shall be pleased to have suggestions in order that it may be made an effective amendment. You have either to take the amendment as a guide or you have to consider that the President is perfectly free to disregard it, of course. But you take it as a guide; then the conference must be confined in good faith to economic questions. I am perfectly aware of the proposition that they could consider anything which came before them for consideration. They could do it by disregarding the suggestions of the amendment; but nothing which they would consider could ultimately be binding until it was returned to the Congress of the United States for the action and approval of the Congress of the United States, or the Senate.

In that connection the Senator from Massachusetts referred to the question of our debts and said that the debts might come up for consideration before this body. Of course they might come up for consideration, but the negotiators could not cancel the debts or postpone the time in which they should be taken care of or change the interest or dispose of the subject until it came back to the Congress of the United States for its action. I take it there will be no conference called until negotiations have been had such as are supposed to be going on now as to the subject matters which will be dealt with, and if the President desires to confine the conference to economic questions, he will have it within his power to do so, and he will have the amendment backing him to that extent.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the argument that nothing can be done which would bind us until it is written into a treaty and is ratified by the Senate is of course good. That is true of any kind of a conference we might call. The Senator is well aware of the fact that when you call a conference you intend to do something, and we never should enter upon a plan or scheme unless we have in advance determined that the thing to be done is wise.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is no use debating that subject, because if it is unwise of course we do not want any action by Congress at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. But I have concluded long since that it is wise. Of course, as I have said, so far as I am concerned that is not open to debate, but the method of dealing with it is.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am glad to get the Senator's position on that. He has concluded it is wise, and therefore we ought to do it, in his judgment.

Mr. BORAH. In my judgment; but I am only one of 96.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody has more respect for the Senator's opinion than I have, but for those who may not have made up their minds that it is wise to go through with this program it is no answer to their objection to say that we may do something unwise but that we can afterwards refuse to ratify it. I have heard that argument advanced before, as has the Senator, "Let us go ahead; we do not have to ratify." But we all know the tremendous force of a tentative arrangement that is made between the representatives of governments, and we all know how embarrassing it would be to our own country to initiate this program and then at the end say, "Oh, well, you did something which did not suit us, and while our representatives agreed to it the Congress will disagree to it." We have heard that argument before.

Mr. BORAH. We had a very good illustration of it in connection with the Versailles treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly; and I do not want to see it repeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Missouri, they are agreed upon the idea that if we enter into any conference at all with the other nations of the earth, we must enter into it with a fixed idea which we must not change while we carry on the conference.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. BORAH. I do not take that position.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody else does.

Mr. BORAH. I do not take it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Missouri to say that we could only enter into a conference to accomplish some purpose which we outlined, and I understood the Senator from Idaho partially to agree with that. I merely rose to say—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator did not understand me. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well, then.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senators have a misunderstanding between themselves, I would like to proceed until they come to an agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me further, I merely wanted to say that if we enter into a conference with other nations with fixed ideas, from which we must not vary, that is not a conference at all; it is a meeting called by us, with a chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer appointed beforehand and a plan outlined. Of course, if we enter into a conference with other nations we must confer with them as well as they with us, and we must reach some conclusion that was not the fixed purpose of every nation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it must be the finally compromised opinion of all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while I always hesitate to object to interruptions, I would like to proceed for a short time with the expression of my views in regard to the necessity of the amendment.

I look upon the question of dealing with these economic problems as distinctly at this time an American question, not exclusively so but inclusively so. It has reached the point where we are just as deeply concerned and ultimately to be quite as much affected by the situation as any European power. It can no longer be said that in dealing with these matters we are dealing with exclusively European questions. It is quite as much and in some respects quite as seriously an American question as the question of the war was in the spring of 1917. The conflict had proceeded in Europe for over two years and it was not regarded previous to that time as a question affecting American interests sufficiently to justify the United States taking part in the war. The invasion of Belgium had taken place. The outrage of Louvain and many of the things which were regarded as the most atrocious acts of the war happened between 1914 and 1917. But there came a time when the question reached the United States, when the subject had to be dealt with by the American people. If we are to believe the reports which come to us from every quarter not only in Europe but in the United States the economic problems have now reached the point where they are of practical concern to the people of the United States. It is now an American problem. We are suffering and suffering greatly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield for a question, and then I wish the Senator would permit me to proceed for a time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall permit the Senator to proceed now, if that is his wish.

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is on his feet and I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall not interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. For illustration, we are now considering the naval appropriation bill. A little over a year ago we held a disarmament conference. The naval appropriation this year is \$1,250,000 more than it was last year. We are advised by a report of the House committee that unless disarmament is extended to certain other subjects we shall again in a short time be in the midst of a naval race. In other words, we are now confronting a situation where we are to lose any possible advantage which was secured by reason of the disarmament conference a year ago, and in addition to that are undoubtedly to take upon ourselves a tremendous burden in the way of a renewed or a new naval constructive competitive program.

In addition to that, every spokesman of the administration, having regard now for the representatives in the Cabinet, is advising the American people that we must increase our Navy and enlarge our Army far beyond anything that we now have in mind. We are told by representatives of the Navy and by representatives of the Army that that condition is necessary by reason of conditions which obtain in Europe; that owing to the disturbances and discontent and unsettled conditions with reference to economic questions, and particularly reparations questions, the situation in Europe is so perilous that the United States can do no other than to prepare for another possible

conflict. It is not, therefore, purely a question for the Executive. It is not purely or solely a European question. It is also an American question and it is essentially and indispensably so.

I think it is pretty generally conceded that if another year shall transpire with reference to reparations such as the last year has been, and another year of conditions such as have prevailed in Europe shall be covered by the coming 12 months, war is imminent upon the continent of Europe, not between small nations or insignificant nations, but between the great powers of Europe.

I venture to say, after witnessing what happened in the campaign of 1916, and what happened immediately after the campaign of 1916, that if any conflict arises in Europe within the next year it will be practically impossible for us to remain out of the conflict. It is the height of prudence, therefore, and the first call of patriotism for the American people's authorized representatives to undertake to ameliorate the situation or to adjust the situation so as to eliminate the sources of discontent and the sources of turmoil in Europe.

The conditions which there confront us are peculiarly and particularly economic in their nature. The entire subject is organized around the question of reparations. To-day in every one of the leading countries whose budget I have been permitted to examine there is an increase in the military budget, and the justification of it is upon the ground of the unsettled conditions relative to reparations and the consequences which may follow.

So we are facing another continental disturbance. We are facing it by reason of the fact that there is a question of the settlement of the amount of reparations and a question of the adjustment of the controlling economic problems between Germany and France. If it were purely a European question or a European problem, if it had not reached us, if it were not here every day in our lives, affecting our standard of living and our taxes and affecting our appropriations and everything else with which we have to do, it might well be contended that it was premature to undertake to deal with it. But it is upon us. It enters into all our affairs. It influences our legislation. It has its effect upon our appropriations and it weighs with great heaviness upon all our people.

The conditions in Europe have been referred to of late by some whose position to judge is such that we are not permitted to disregard their suggestions. I read a statement from the American ambassador at St. James, a single line from an extended interview, in which he said:

The meeting of allied premiers in London is the most important conference that has been held since 1918. If they are unable to find a solution, I do not know what is going to save the continent of Europe from utter wreckage.

Well, before the wreckage takes place in its ultimate effect there will be something more than an economic disturbance. Before the matter has reached the point where we may consider it as a financial or industrial breakdown there will be other conditions attach to it from which we will have difficulty in divorcing ourselves as they proceed.

I have also the statement of a leading French publicist, who supports in even a more pronounced way the view just read from the American ambassador, that without a settlement or an adjustment of these conditions Europe is facing another world conflict. I might spend the afternoon in reading that which is familiar to all Senators, that it is now recognized that we have reached a crisis in the economic affairs in Europe which extends to and includes the economic conditions and affairs also of the United States, and the question is whether or not we are going to undertake to deal with it now or whether we shall disregard it until such time as it forces us to take action probably in a different way.

This condition of affairs going on for the last two or three years has drawn us further and further into Europe. We are further into the affairs of Europe now than we were upon the 4th day of March, 1921. We are now concerning ourselves with more of the affairs of Europe, necessarily I shall assume, than we were a year and a half or two years ago. We are being drawn further and further into the affairs of Europe by reason of the economic problems with which Europe is now contending. We ratified what is known as the German treaty. Without debating now the wisdom or the unwisdom of doing it, the result of the ratification was to claim upon our part all the rights under the Versailles treaty which had been accredited or granted to the United States by its terms, and now, to all practical effects so far as our moral influence is concerned and, in my opinion, so far as the technical influence is concerned, we are assisting in the administering of the Versailles treaty.

We are sitting upon the reparations commission, not officially it is said, but in Europe they do not discern the difference so

far as the results of the acts of the commission are concerned. Mr. Boyden, at the head of our commission there, takes part in the discussion of every question which comes up. He not only offers his views but he offers his argument and insists upon this or that being the correct course. Does anyone undertake to say that with a representative of the United States sitting upon the commission, with the moral backing and influence of the United States, urging a certain course or suggesting it, that it is without influence in affecting the course which the commission takes? It is in practical effect the administration of the Versailles treaty by this commission, in which we are not merely an observer looking on to report back to the President of the United States as to what takes place. We are far more than a reporter at that conference. We are a participant in the conference. It may be thought wise, especially for home effect, to avoid some technical proceedings but the ultimate results are the same.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, with regard to Mr. Boyden's part in the conference, I took occasion to ask the Secretary of State on yesterday, and he told me that Mr. Boyden never voted; that he took no part in the conference unless he was asked for his opinion; that he was acting entirely unofficially and that was perfectly understood by every power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it may be that technically Mr. Boyden does not vote, but the Secretary of State is misinformed if he thinks that Mr. Boyden waits for somebody to ask him for his opinion before he expresses it. I have talked with gentlemen who have sat upon subdivisions of the commission and they advise me to the contrary; that, so far as they were individually concerned, they took precisely the same part upon the subdivisions of the commission as did anybody else.

Mr. LODGE. I can only state the information which I have received from the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORAH. I think that technically, perhaps, Mr. Boyden does not vote, and not once in ten times do they ever come to a final conclusion by reason of a vote.

Mr. President, there is very little there for Mr. Boyden to observe if he is simply an observer; but there is a vast amount for him to do if he is there as a participant; and he is there all the time.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, of course if Mr. Boyden is doing what the Senator from Idaho suggests, he must be acting contrary to his instructions, which I think is very unlikely.

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to discuss that, but I have my opinion about it. I do not doubt the technical instructions but I have no doubt as to effect of what he is doing.

Mr. LODGE. Of course I have not been present at those meetings, but I implicitly believe what the Secretary of State says about his understanding of the matter.

Mr. BORAH. I am not questioning the veracity of the Secretary of State, but I know that Mr. Boyden is not sitting there merely as an observer and doing nothing but to take note of what happens and to report it back to the United States. He goes much further. I am advised that there is no more influential man in the body in bringing about results than is Mr. Boyden.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I do not know the sources of the information of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I think that it is inevitable. The Senator will remember that under the German treaty we reserved the right, in case we elected to do so, to have membership on the Reparation Commission, and I think we have elected to do so for all practical purposes; we are there.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the view of the Secretary of State; I can say that certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I defer to his view, for he is a great lawyer, and as a lone technical proposition he could sustain his position.

Mr. LODGE. I also know Mr. Boyden. He comes from Boston, and is a man of very high character and great ability. When the Secretary of State says Mr. Boyden holds no official position, that he is recognized as being unofficial, and that he speaks only when called upon, I rather think the Secretary of State so understands the situation, unless he is grossly misinformed.

Mr. BORAH. I am not questioning what the Secretary of State understands, but does the Senator from Massachusetts contend that in paying for the Reparation Commission the German Government does not pay our commissioner also?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know anything about the payments to commissioners.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Idaho stated that he thought we had elected to take our place upon the Reparation Commission. Is it not a fact that that election was reserved to Congress, and no power was reposed in the Executive to make such election?

Mr. LODGE. That is reserved in the treaty, of course. The President can not send a representative without our confirmation.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin turn to the German treaty?

Mr. LENROOT. I have it not before me, and I have made the statement merely from my recollection of the language. I will be glad to correct my statement if it is ascertained that I am wrong about it.

Mr. BORAH. I thought I had a copy of the treaty here, but I have not. It may be that that power was reserved to Congress. I know that at the time it was contended that only Congress should authorize such representation, but that was not the view of all the Senate. It may be that we put a reservation onto the treaty in reference to that matter; I think perhaps we did; but that does not change the situation a particle as to what is practically taking place with reference to the activities of the Reparation Commission.

However, Mr. President, suppose that we admit that technically Mr. Boyden is not an official member of the Reparation Commission, which I am perfectly willing to do; suppose we admit that technically he does not vote; no one who has been in attendance there pretends to say that he is not constantly engaged in the administration of the affairs which come up for the decision of the Reparation Commission. He is not there merely as an observer to report information, but he is participating and taking part in the discussions and proceedings.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Idaho, of course, does not contend that Mr. Boyden could make any sort of an agreement that would be binding upon the United States?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, he could not make an agreement which would technically be binding upon the United States, but they are operating under a treaty and when a decision is made the function of the commission ends.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. BORAH. But we are now discussing what is actually taking place there so far as our activities in Europe are concerned with reference to existing conditions. Mr. Boyden is advising in regard to them just the same as a conference here would advise in regard to them.

Mr. WATSON. If the gentleman from the United States sitting there unofficially has such weight that his advice is of controlling influence, then of necessity we would be more or less bound by what he says, would we not?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; we might be morally bound under certain conditions.

Mr. WATSON. By the same process of reasoning, if we call a conference and appoint a conferee to that conference and that conferee, for instance, agrees there that the foreign debt which is owing to us shall be forgiven, then would we not be morally bound by that agreement?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think so, because that is a mere matter of negotiation.

Mr. WATSON. Ah; but we call the conference. The work of the Reparation Commission is a matter of negotiation.

Mr. BORAH. No; the work of the Reparation Commission is not one of negotiation. It is in the nature of the administration of government.

Mr. WATSON. Largely it is a matter of negotiation as between the commissioners. They are there to negotiate.

Mr. BORAH. No; they are not negotiating. They are administering a form of government. The Reparation Commission is a form of government, in the heart of Europe, with governmental powers, and is exercising governmental powers, both legislative and quasi judicial.

Mr. WATSON. That is partially true; but, aside from that, coming back to the other question, let me ask my friend from Idaho if, under the sweeping terms of the Senator's amendment and without limitation, we appoint a member of the proposed conference to represent us at the conference and at that conference he should agree that the debts that are owed us by foreign countries should be forgiven, would we not then be morally bound to stand by that agreement?

Mr. BORAH. Let me ask the Senator this question, and then perhaps we can come to a conclusion: Suppose the President of the United States, through the Secretary of State and his foreign ambassadors, with the aid of the international bankers, should come to a conclusion that we should cancel the

foreign debts and should agree to that, would we not be morally bound?

Mr. WATSON. I am inclined to think that we would be.

Mr. BORAH. Then, let us have it in the open.

Mr. WATSON. We are going to have it in the open. It can not be done secretly; but the Senator is not willing, I understand, to include that limitation in his amendment.

Mr. BORAH. I have not said that. There has been no amendment offered. Whenever it shall be offered I will be perfectly willing to consider it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, in view of the legislation passed creating the debt commission, does the Senator think that we would be morally bound if the President should make any arrangement for the cancellation of the debt?

Mr. BORAH. I think under certain conditions we might be morally bound.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not; but I wish to say to the Senator I have before me the reservation to which reference was made a few moments ago, and it expressly reserves the right of representation through the action of Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Then if the President could not bind us in a moral way by reason of his negotiations, he being the Executive, I do not think that the conference would morally bind us either.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think the Senator believes that President Wilson morally bound the Congress when he negotiated the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, morally bound is one proposition and legally bound is another; but if the President through his agents were to agree upon a cancellation of the debt we would not be bound to any greater degree than where the President has negotiated a treaty and sent it up to us. We reject treaties regardless of the sense of moral obligation, if any there be.

Mr. BORAH. But there could not be any higher moral obligation come from the proposed conference than comes from the duly authorized power of the Government to negotiate a treaty.

Mr. WATSON. Which is my contention. I thought the Senator was contending otherwise, as he contended frequently in his arguments against the League of Nations, that whenever we appointed a representative to sit in the council or in the assembly, regardless of his power, and that representative entered into an agreement, we were morally bound, and from that moral obligation there would be no escape.

Mr. BORAH. We are digressing now from the matter which is of concern to me, and that is what we are actually doing in Europe at the present time. Whether technically, morally, legally, or accidentally, the question is we are drifting further and further into Europe.

Now, let me call attention to another proposition. We have an army on the Rhine in Europe. What is its business there? It is four years now since the war closed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How much of an army have we there?

Mr. BORAH. All they want. We have all that is deemed essential.

Mr. REED of Missouri. About 800 men; is not that the number?

Mr. WATSON. About 1,000 men.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I secured a statement from the Secretary of War just a day or two ago with reference to that question, and he stated that there are in Europe just a little over 1,000 men and, I think, 118 officers.

Mr. BORAH. What are 1,000 men doing there? Why is an American army there? Why is the American flag there? Why is the Government of the United States in the representation of its flag and its Army there? We must be there for some purpose; we must be there to effect a result, and it is supposed that 1,000 men are sufficient to effect that result. I assume if 10,000 were necessary to accomplish the same result they would be there. The fact is, Mr. President, by our presence there we are doing precisely what France asked us to do, or, rather, what was proposed in the treaty, namely, that we should guarantee the territorial integrity of France against the unprovoked aggression of Germany.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in a moment. So long as our soldiers are guarding the bridgeheads over the Rhine we are effecting the same result precisely that France anticipated would result from a signing of the treaty; we are giving notice to Germany and to the other nations of the world that our influence, our sympathy, our flag, and our Government are upon the side of France in the aggressions of Germany, and if the treaty between France and Great Britain and the United States

with reference to the boundary between Germany and France had been ratified it would not be anything different from what we are doing now. We are assisting in guarding and protecting the frontier of France. What other purpose would the treaty serve? If our soldiers must take the place of the treaty indefinitely, then I prefer the treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator think and has he not thought for a long time that the American troops in Germany ought to be brought home?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. So do I.

Mr. BORAH. And one reason why we should want to settle the economic problems is to bring the troops home and to get out of Europe. I feel they will be there so long as this fearful condition continues.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Would it not be easier to bring the troops home than it would be to have the proposed conference?

Mr. BORAH. You can not bring them home, nor can I.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We could make the President do it.

Mr. BORAH. We could not make the President do it. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and if in the discharge of his duty he wants to assign them there, I do not know of any power that we can exert to compel him to bring them home. We may refuse to create an Army, but when it is created he is the commander.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I wish to change my statement. We can not make him bring them home, because none of us want to make the President do anything, but I think if there were a resolution passed asking the President to bring the troops home, where they belong, the President would recognize that request from Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, during the campaign of 1920 the President of the United States stated to the public that the troops had no business in Europe and that they would be brought home. This matter was debated in the Senate of the United States, and afterwards the Secretary of War stated that the troops were being brought home, and that they would all be home just as soon as we could get ships enough to carry them. The representative of France in this country—the French ambassador—made his protest to the Secretary of War, according to the press, and the President of the United States, and they kept them in Europe. Why were they kept there? We are just as much involved in that situation as if we had signed the treaty, and they are being kept there for the same identical purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, those troops, of course, as the Senator knows, are not there under the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I may concede they are not.

Mr. LODGE. They are there under the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly aware that such is the contention. We did not ratify the Versailles treaty; but when we failed to ratify the treaty we apparently substituted the troops to keep the guard instead of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. We kept them under the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. Let us admit it; but why are we keeping them there? What are they there for?

Mr. LODGE. That I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. No; and no living man can tell for the reasons would admit the whole contention.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, did not the armistice end when our separate treaty with Germany was ratified?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; precisely so. I thank the Senator.

Now, the fact is, Mr. President, that we are dealing with this situation in what I think is a roundabout way. Here is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who is in as close touch with the Secretary of State as any other man in the Senate, and perhaps more so. We find our troops upon the Rhine, and he notifies us that he does not know why they are there. I know why they are there. They are there because it is not thought wise, it is not thought safe, to bring them out so long as Europe is in her present condition; and I venture to believe that if you will ask the Secretary of State why they are there, or the Secretary of War, and they feel free to speak fully, they will tell you that the French ambassador notified them that under present conditions in Europe, the question of the reparations and the unsettled conditions which prevailed, it was necessary to have the troops there as a part of the moral force to keep the peace. That will be the reason in substance and effect.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Let me ask another thing. Suppose that upon to-morrow morning the German troops should attack the forces on the Rhine. Suppose that M. Clem-

enceau's fears should prove to be well founded, and they have been manufacturing arms and munitions, and that they have hundreds of thousands of men ready at any time to take to arms. Suppose they should do so, and should undertake to take the Rhine. Our soldiers would be in the front of the fight and the United States would be in the midst of a European war.

I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I know this much about keeping the troops there: One reason, I know, is that they are there at the earnest request of Germany.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, you can find all the German authority you want that they would be delighted to have us send the troops home. There may be a division of opinion in Germany about that. There may be some who desire them there. If so, it is for the same reason that we are keeping them there, and that is because of the unsettled conditions in Europe. Certainly Germany would not want our troops there, costing her as they are, unless she thought that the unsettled and discontented conditions in Europe made it essential for them to be there.

Mr. LODGE. If our troops were moved from the bridgehead at Coblenz, the Senator knows perfectly well that their places would be taken by French troops.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I am talking about America being in Europe, not about France being in Europe. That is where France ought to be.

Mr. LODGE. I said nothing about France being in Europe. My information is not extensive, but I know that France is in Europe.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and there are some who think this country ought to be.

Mr. LODGE. And they will not get rid of troops at Coblenz by removing the American troops. I think they ought to be brought home, as a personal matter of opinion.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. Well, everybody thinks they ought to be brought home, and nobody will vote to bring them home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me, in spite of his late refusal to be interrupted?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. When the question was raised a year ago about bringing home those troops it was opposed without much ceremony.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it seems that I must be courteous to all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He and the Senator from Massachusetts both seem to be agreed that our troops on the Rhine ought to be brought home; and the Senator has just said that everybody says that, but nobody wants to do it. I want to call his attention to the fact that I have never said it and I do not think they ought to be brought home. I think the American flag ought to be there; and when the Senator says that they are there for the purpose of making Germany observe the terms of the treaty of peace I admit that, and I think they ought to be there for that express purpose.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and so do the people who are keeping them there think they ought to be there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because, outside of the treaty of peace, we were parties to the armistice. Whether we went into the treaty of peace or not, we were parties to the armistice; and a part of the armistice terms was that we were to occupy the gateways to the Rhine until Germany conformed to the treaty of peace which was to be afterwards entered into.

Mr. BORAH. It is now four years since we closed the war. The troops are still there. That is a physical fact. You can explain and excuse and refine upon the reasons, but there they are four years after the war, and two years after the promise was made to bring them home. It must be a powerful and controlling reason. I do not know what specific reason would be assigned if it were deemed necessary to assign a reason, but I venture the opinion that the real reason is because of the unsettled conditions in Europe, particularly over the question of reparations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. They would not be there unless they were taken for some such purpose as the Senator from Mississippi suggests; and they will not be brought home, in my humble opinion—that is to say, our presence on the Rhine will be maintained—until peace is restored, until the present conditions are settled, until the turmoil which is now seething shall have an end.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Until Germany conforms to the terms of the armistice, which hitherto she has not done.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. Then, if that is to be the time, and the treaty is to remain unchanged, there is no child now living who will see the time when our troops will return.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, while this subject is up I should like to ask the Senator if he will accept the amendment which I am going to send to the desk?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I certainly do not want to yield here for the purpose of offering amendments and accepting amendments.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator will wait until I get through, I will discuss the amendment with him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator allow me to send it to the desk to be printed without being read?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and the Senator may have it read if he wishes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Let it be read, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to amend by adding at the end of the Borah amendment the following:

The President is requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all American troops now stationed in Germany.

Mr. BORAH. In so far as I am able to do so, I would favor the amendment. But I think it stands upon its own merits. That will accomplish one thing which I want to accomplish by adjusting the conditions in Europe. That is one step toward getting out of Europe.

Mr. President, we will not adopt that resolution and that amendment, in my opinion, but in all probability those troops will remain there indefinitely. There is no probability now of their being brought home, and it is by reason of the conditions which now prevail in Europe.

It may not be out of place here to call attention to the situation with reference to these troops, both of France and of the United States, upon the Rhine. I have a communication to the Baltimore Sun by Mr. Bouton, the European correspondent, in which it is said—he claims to speak, so far as he gives data or figures, from the record—

The debt owed to the Allies by Germany * * * is being increased daily by more than 4,000,000 gold marks of absolutely unproductive expenses. The further absolutely unproductive occupation of tillable land for military purposes is adding even more millions to this sum yearly.

But the unproductive wastage along the Rhine goes on unchecked. The average linotype probably does not contain enough ciphers to give in paper marks the amount required of Germany yearly to support the armies of occupation. But it can be given in another way. Let the reader set down 3,200 and then add nine ciphers to that sum. It is a good deal of money, even in paper marks. It would be a good deal in cowrie shells or wampum. And it amounts to almost eight times the total domestic budget of Germany. For unproductive purposes!

In other words, there is being maintained upon the Rhine at this time an army which in expense to Germany amounts to almost eight times her domestic budget; and the one great problem which is now tormenting the world is how Germany shall be able to meet the reparations judgment, whatever it may finally come to be. Under the present program and under the present policy which is being pursued the time will never come when Germany can meet this situation, and so it is postponed indefinitely; and unless there is some understanding or some conference or some arrangement or some agreement by which a changed condition can be brought about Germany will not be able to meet the demands which are now placed upon her and we will be drawn deeper and deeper and deeper into Europe from year to year, in my opinion. It is not, my friends, for the purpose of getting into Europe, it is for the purpose of getting out of Europe, that I believe it is absolutely necessary to exert whatever influence we can as an independent power to deal with the situation which is now keeping us there and drawing us deeper and deeper into her affairs each year.

Take the Lausanne conference: True, we were there unofficially! That is the saving grace; but, unofficially, what are we doing? In two particular instances we are informed by the Associated Press that our unofficial representative was the deciding factor in bringing about certain situations. Could he have accomplished any more had he been official? Would we have been bound by his acts as a Nation, morally speaking, in any different way, had he sat there officially? Even if he had sat there officially, he could not have bound us to any greater extent, in my judgment, unless he reported back a treaty which we ratified. So, as a practical proposition, there is no subject that comes up in Europe that we are not undertaking to deal with, and exerting our influence and exerting ineffectively and therefore unwisely. Whatever the conference may be, or whatever it may be called, we are there speaking for the United

States in some form. Whether we cast a vote or not, we are exerting our influence to bring about a certain policy or a certain condition; and Europe looks upon it, and is coming to look upon it, as something more than mere observing and reporting back.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to some of the conditions in this country which result by reason of the unsettled affairs in Europe. I call attention to these conditions because they seem to me to justify our consideration of this subject matter even if there were no other reasons. I do not believe for a moment that the President of the United States can be unconcerned as to the conditions in this country or as to why those conditions exist. Therefore I do not believe that the President can be idle or inactive with reference to bringing about a change in the situation. We are informed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that he is active in the matter.

As I said in the beginning, if this amendment will embarrass the President, if it will in any way disconcert the Chief Executive, if it will embarrass instead of help, that is the most conclusive argument which could be presented against it, in my judgment. If, on the other hand, it is looked upon as a problem which not only requires the technical skill and the negotiating power of the Secretary of State and of the President, but should have the moral support and the public opinion of the United States behind it, and the treaty-making power behind it, then there is every reason why this amendment should be adopted.

When I see Europe sinking lower into misery and suffering, and when I know that our own people are suffering by reason of that, and when I know that countless millions of Europe are this winter to suffer and thousands of them die, I am not willing to sit without at least expressing my conviction that something ought to be done, if it is possible to do it, and I can not conceive that it is embarrassing the President of the United States in the slightest for the whole world to know that the Senate of the United States would like to see him negotiate for an adjustment of these conditions.

Has the Senate of the United States become so inconsequential, has it become so utterly without power or respect among the nations of the earth and with our own people, that it should either be indifferent to such a situation or, if not indifferent, that it should keep its views to itself for fear of disturbing some fanciful situation not disclosed?

Let us look at the situation in this country for a moment. Our markets in Europe are indispensable to the prosperity of the American producer. We sell from 23 to 25 per cent of our wheat abroad. Unless that amount finds a market, it is impossible for the American farmer to realize a price which will justify his raising the wheat.

I read a statement prepared by a financier of the Middle West, which I have seen verified several times and which I have no doubt is correct. If it is incorrect, the able Senator from Utah can correct me, because I know he is informed about these things. This statement says:

The decreased purchasing power of Europe from 1919 to 1921, inclusive, has a very vital relationship to the present agricultural depression in America. For instance, in 1919 Europe purchased 332,000,000 pounds of beef from the United States, but only 21,000,000 in 1921.

In other words, there was sold to Europe in 1921 about one-fifteenth of what was sold to Europe in 1919.

Europe purchased 1,238,000,000 pounds of bacon in 1919 but only 489,000,000 in 1921. * * * What happened? The American live-stock industry became demoralized and the value of her live stock, approximately the same number of head, dropped from \$8,800,000,000 in 1919 to \$6,200,000,000 in 1921—a loss to the live-stock industry of America of about \$75,000,000 for each month of the entire 36 months—a total loss of \$2,600,000,000 to the live-stock industry in America.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. My friends, is not that a matter of supreme concern to the people of the United States, to the Senate of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, and to every business man in the United States? Could anything be more direct and essential for the consideration of this Government and its representatives than by some method to relieve that situation, whatever the method may be? You may pass tariff bills time out of mind, but unless the markets of Europe are restored upon these matters for which we must find a market in Europe, we will not enjoy the prosperity in this country which we have said to the American people they were to enjoy. It is indispensable; it is a part of our domestic policy; it is a matter which concerns us all. It is not the mere question of negotiating a treaty relating alone to foreign matters. It is dealing with a subject as wide and broad as the

conditions of the American people and the people of Europe combined can prevent.

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator has anticipated me by making a very wholesome admission that tariff duties will not prevent a fall in the prices of articles when we cease to export them.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I am not going into a tariff debate. My vote upon the tariff question speaks for itself.

Mr. President, since my amendment was offered I do not know how many telegrams from farm organizations of the United States I have had, but a vast number. The members of those organizations are perfectly well aware of the situation. They know the condition which confronts us. They are not satisfied and will not be satisfied with having us pass a farm credit bill, which will only postpone the day of wrath in case this situation is not adjusted. They realize fully that they must have their foreign market. They are quite as keen in regard to this matter as those of us who have the honor to represent them here.

I have a communication from one farm organization in the Middle West, which says:

Do you know that in the last five months we have exported 45,000,000 bushels less of wheat than we did a year ago for the same period?

Do you know that when a Frenchman buys a bushel of wheat on account of the depreciation of francs that it costs him \$4? Do you know that Italy is again eating black bread? Do you know that Germany is again rationing flour? Do you know that a boy came to a bank here the other day and for \$5 bought 30,648 marks to be sent to his folks back home?

Do you know that our beef exports are only one-fifteenth of what they were in 1919, while Argentina's are greater every year? Do you know that Russia used to ship to western Europe 250,000,000 bushels of wheat every year? Do you know that there are 300,000,000 people of Europe who are being only partly fed but who if they were allowed to come anywhere near getting a square meal daily would more than consume all our surplus? Do you know that the world produced 1,000,000,000 bushels less of wheat in 1922 than it did in 1913? Do you know that Europe is desperately trying to buy our products, and paid us last year \$667,000,000 in gold and has paid us this year over \$400,000,000?

These are the conditions which lead me to believe that this is our question, this is our problem, from which we can not escape.

Another communication says:

The Ford County Farm Bureau members assembled in annual meeting believe that everything necessary should be done to restore the farmer's market. For our surplus production, this market is overseas. We realize that the question of the German reparations * * * are inextricably interwoven.

Mr. President, there are not more goods in the world to-day than the world needs. There is not more food than the human family could properly use, and the peoples of the earth want to trade with one another. They want to deal with one another. They want to exchange the things which are rotting in their ground in some parts of the earth with those who are starving for them in other parts of the earth. They are not permitted to do so because of the political masters and political policies of Europe. They are kept from dealing with each other by reason of artificial conditions, and not by reason of reasonable or natural conditions.

We are just as much interested in that proposition as any nation in Europe or any people in Europe. It comes home to us in every vital way. It is menacing from an economic, and physical, and moral standpoint.

Mr. President, possibly I view the situation with too much concern. It may be that the impatience which I have no doubt we all feel at the slow recovery of economic health and at the tenacious hold which the spirit of turmoil and war maintain upon world affairs have clouded my view and distorted my outlook. But I do know that a deep and moving spirit of unrest, of discontent, has wrought upon our own people to their utter change in many ways. The fearful wave of lawlessness, the saturnalia of crime, which have swept over and engulfed this land for months, and which still linger, are not without a cause. The unusual apathy, the apparent indifference of entire communities, whole States, to these crimes are not natural to this people who have, through the century, built up a magnificent fabric of free government, the keystone of which, as they well know, is obedience to law. There is a cause for these things, an overwhelming cause. And I know of nothing which undermines the people's faith, which breaks down the nation's morale, like the fiscal policy which robs thrift of its savings, takes from frugality its reward, and plants the tax collector like a policeman upon his watch at the doorstep of every enterprising home. Why should men toil? Why save? Why plan for to-morrow? Rather, why not eat and drift and waste, for at the end of the year the result is

the same. Not only that, but desperate times are the harvest times of the usurer and the profiteer. Taking advantage of the necessities of the unhoused and the needy, of the farmer or business man in distress, they ply their trade with unchallenged and unlimited success. They wriggle their slimy way through the wreck of vanishing hopes and baffled efforts, and like the ghoul on the field of Waterloo, of whom Hugo speaks, cutting the jewels from the fingers of the dead and snatching mementoes from the clutches of the dying, escape at last with their stained and sordid plunder. These things, all these things, make for discouragement, make for demoralization, make for despair, make for crime. We have reached a point where a fight for fiscal relief is a fight for the American home, for the unity and stability of the family, for American manhood and womanhood, a fight for that citizenship—free, intelligent, hopeful, confident—which made America and which alone can preserve America.

This is the situation as I see it in my own country. Will any deny the serious conditions upon every hand? Now, sir, what is the plan? What is proposed to be done? If this plan is not wise, what is your plan? Are we to sit idle and listless while conditions grow worse? I will gladly yield to a wiser, more effective plan, but so long as no other is proposed I deem it not only right but a solemn duty to urge this course.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator holds the political masters of Europe responsible for erecting barriers against natural trade and exchange. Should he not also hold the political masters of the United States responsible for some of those barriers erected against international commerce? Have we not only recently passed a tariff law which makes it almost impossible for European countries to pay us in their products for the products of ours which they purchase over here?

Let me ask the Senator another question: Is his amendment broad enough, in his opinion, to permit the European nations at such a conference as he proposes to suggest to us that if we would lower our tariffs against European goods they would be enabled to buy our farm products?

Mr. BORAH. I would not have any fear of the President of the United States paying any attention to the suggestion. They could suggest that we give them a voice in financial legislation. But such suggestions no one would consider.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would his amendment be broad enough?

Mr. BORAH. I think it might for the suggestion. I am not so sensitive about the tariff act as some others, and so I do not worry about such suggestion. I think on the tariff the President would be equal to the occasion.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I would like to suggest to the Senator that notwithstanding that last year was the shortest crop of cotton grown in the last 25 years—less than 8,000,000 bales—yet there were 2,800,000 bales carried over, and to-day the people in the South are selling their live stock by the hundreds because of the low prices prevailing, and laborers are leaving by the thousands.

Mr. BORAH. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] just informs me that there was more cotton exported this year than last year. I think possibly that is true. It was stated the other day in a press dispatch that Russia had purchased a very large amount of cotton from southern planters. In spite of every effort upon our part, Russia has gotten back where she has become a purchaser from the United States, but by no grace of ours.

Mr. President, there is another reason why we should deal with the existing situation. I am not going to refer to it at length at this time. I have already spoken too long. It may come up later in the debate. There are humanitarian reasons not only in Europe but in this country which ought to inspire us with an effort to help to bring about a different condition of affairs. If we couple all the subject matters together—our presence in Europe, our getting deeper and deeper into the affairs of Europe, also the economic questions and humanitarian questions—from whatever point we may view the subject matter, it is certainly incumbent on the United States to move. If there is, as I said, a plan in hand or a scheme in process of being formed—if the negotiations which are reported in the newspapers between Mr. Morgan and other parties are ripening into final results which will be beneficial to the people of the

United States—and that is thought to be the best way to deal with the subject matter, I am perfectly willing, when the facts are presented, to consider them.

But certainly the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of this body, will not take the position as a leader of the Senate and a leader of the Republican Party that we ought not to do anything. Certainly the Republican Party will not take the position that we ought not to have a program. Certainly we will not take the position that we ought not to proceed to exert whatever influence or power we have to bring about a satisfactory settlement of these conditions. We may fail. That is not impossible. We certainly will not accomplish it if we do not try. I know that there are many Members of this body who thought that the disarmament conference was a mere dream and that we should fail. But from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts to-day we know that we did not fail. We brought back a remarkable result.

A year has passed since that time, and that year, my friends, has been as a century at other times. The things which have happened in Europe during the last year would scarcely have been recorded in a half century in ordinary times. Every budget in Europe is being increased by reason of those conditions. Taxes are being constantly laid upon the people by reason of those conditions. They are borrowing money day by day. I have upon my desk the report of a distinguished publicist and economist of the United States who has been abroad for three months, and who made a report of conditions, a report which I would not dare to read without his most pronounced consent. But they are nearing the brink. Chaos is ahead. Conditions are insufferable. The greatest legislative body in the world can not disregard those conditions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, with very much of what was said by the able Senator from Idaho I agree. But I confess I have been astonished, as I am sure most of the Senators have been astonished who were present during the long, long fight upon the League of Nations and upon the four-power treaty and heard the Senator's eloquent speeches then insisting upon our remaining completely aloof from Europe and keeping out of European questions, with his position to-day, evidenced not only by his amendment, but by his speech, that he to-day is in favor of the United States thrusting itself into the very midst of the European problem. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the conversion of Saul of Tarsus was not more marked than the apparent conversion of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator from Wisconsin will remember that the conversion of the Saul of Tarsus saved his soul.

Mr. LENROOT. I would not for a moment intimate that that is the reason for the Senator's conversion.

Mr. GLASS. The conversion not only saved his life but some of us think it saved the life of the world.

Mr. LENROOT. I was only speaking of the facts and I do not in the least criticize the conversion, if such there be, because I find myself much more in accord with the Senator to-day than during the period to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I only desire to discuss very briefly one phase of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho. I assume that when the amendment is formally presented a point of order will be made against it and I think that the Chair upon the presentation of the matter will be convinced that the amendment is not in order and that such point of order must be sustained. But that discussion will more properly come when the matter is formally before the Senate. The part of the amendment which I desire to discuss is that part only authorizing and requesting the President to call an economic conference—

Charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions.

I can not support the proposition in its present form because it is without condition or limitation and, if adopted, would, in my judgment, build up in Europe false hopes of American relief and American participation in European affairs that could not be realized, and thus postpone and delay the economic rehabilitation of the world instead of advancing it. I believe it would defeat the very purpose that the Senator from Idaho has in mind in proposing it. That such a conference may be held in the near future, under proper conditions and with advance understandings as to the extent of America's participation in it, in my judgment is most desirable; but without such conditions and understandings we shall be doing Europe positive injury as well as ourselves if the United States shall take the initiative in calling it. If the amendment be adopted, all of Europe will accept it as an indication that public opinion in America with refer-

ence to the cancellation of her debts to us has changed, that Clemenceau's mission has been completely successful, that any concession made between European nations will be compensated for by the United States, and that we will stand as a rich and generous uncle, showering our wealth upon them. From the language of the amendment they would have a right to draw such conclusions, because if, as the Senator from Idaho suggests, the President in calling the conference shall attempt to safeguard it by the addition of a limitation they will be able to point to the action of the Congress of the United States where they have requested that the conference be held without condition or limitation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator take the position that neither the Executive nor the Congress should take any step in regard to the matter?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator admit the proposition as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the President is now dealing with it?

Mr. LENROOT. I do accept it, and I hope it is true.

Mr. BORAH. Then that is liable to cause some false hopes in Europe also?

Mr. LENROOT. No—

Mr. BORAH. Possibly not.

Mr. LENROOT. The distinction is, as I think Senators must readily agree, that if the President, without any declaration either upon the part of Congress or upon his own part of being willing to enter into a conference without condition or limitation, makes the proposition that there must be some advance understanding as to the limitations and conditions under which he, as the President of the United States, will be favorable to such a conference, we are in a very different position than if Europe can point to action of the Congress requesting a conference without condition or limitation.

As further evidence of this—that is, the willingness of Congress to have a conference held without condition or limitation—as evidence of a change of opinion upon the part of the United States with reference to the cancellation of the foreign debt they can point to the fact that the proposal comes from the most distinguished isolationist in the United States, the most powerful and eloquent advocate of the complete aloofness of the United States in the political affairs of Europe, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. With all this, some deliver into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find that although the distinguished Senator has at all times preached the doctrine of isolation he at the same time has said:

It is our solemn duty to say to them [Europe], "You can have all that is within our power as a prudent people to give, for we recognize both our obligations to humanity and our material interest in the cause, but you must conform your treaties to the law of live and let live. You must subscribe to the principles of reconstruction and not destruction. You, too, must become advocates and apostles of rehabilitation."

Those are the words of the Senator from Idaho. With all due respect to him, I do not believe that either his policy of isolation or his unbounded generosity under certain conditions meets the approval of the American people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am very grateful to the Senator for finding that quotation, because I have been looking for it all morning.

Mr. LENROOT. I shall be glad to give the Senator a citation of where it can be found.

Mr. BORAH. It states exactly my position to-day. It states precisely my position. I have no desire to change a word or a punctuation.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not question that.

Mr. BORAH. It conforms exactly to what I am trying to do now.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well. Let us understand the purpose and object the Senator from Idaho himself has in the proposed amendment. It is that if Europe will conform to what he thinks Europe ought to do, there is no limit to what America will be willing to do for Europe, which includes, of course, the cancellation of her debt, and includes material help in every possible way. I for one am not willing, even if Europe does those things, to go as far as the Senator from Idaho expresses himself as willing to go.

Mr. BORAH. Would not the Senator be willing to go to the extent to which a prudent nation should go?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; to a certain degree.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I said.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; a prudent nation—give as much help as a prudent nation would be willing to give.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. LENROOT. That immediately carries the idea of what the resources of the United States are and what her resources will permit her to do. Of course, it would be at once said, and we would have to admit, that with the enormous wealth of the United States we should cancel every dollar of the \$11,000,000,000 of indebtedness and we would no doubt prosper permanently in the years to come just the same.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I have here a communication from the President written at the time the disarmament conference was sitting, in which he said:

I have said to inquirers, as I am now pleased to say to you, that it is not of particular concern to the administration what form the expression that Congress shall take, though it is most agreeable that Congress shall express itself in favor of securing, if possible, an international agreement upon a program for the limitation of armament.

Again:

It is wholly desirable to have the expression of a favorable opinion on the part of Congress relating to this world question, and it would seem to me ample if it should be expressed in the broadest and most general terms.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in agreement with that expression of the President upon the subject to which it refers, which was the limitation of armaments. I can not conceive of any general language upon that subject which would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States or operate in effect as a postponement of the result that was desired. Here, however, we have a very different situation, where general language will not only involve the United States in questions in which the American people, in my opinion, are not willing to be involved but, in addition, will operate to postpone the very object that is sought to be secured by the proposal.

I appreciate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Idaho differentiates between an international economic conference and one having to do with political relations; but the two can not be separated. What is the dominant motive and mainspring of every political movement in Europe to-day? It is economic advantage, economic domination. That is true whether we turn to Germany, to Russia, or to Turkey. Why did England finance Greece to fight Turkey, and France and Italy finance Turkey to fight Greece? Was there any reason other than rivalry for economic domination or advantage in the Near East? Will anyone upon this floor pretend otherwise? No man in the Senate has declared more forcefully than has the Senator from Idaho that political sovereignty of a country is an empty shell if there be economic control of that country by another power. Senators will remember the vigorous speeches which the Senator from Idaho has made upon that subject in discussing the relations between Japan and China. In one of them he was led to exclaim, "What does sovereignty amount to if economic control of the situation is in the hands of another power?" It will also be remembered that the Senator from Idaho objected to our being represented on the Reparation Commission under the Versailles treaty upon the ground that it would embroil us in all the political affairs of Europe. No, Mr. President, the attempt to limit the proposed conference to economic questions, if we should go into it without other limitation or restriction, would let us into every European question which the Senator from Idaho for long years has insisted the United States should keep out of.

I have thus referred to the able Senator from Idaho because of his great ability, which is recognized in Europe as well as in America. This proposal coming from him assumes greater importance and will receive a different interpretation than if it had come from almost any other Member of this body. This amendment, if adopted, will convince Europe and the international bankers in America as nothing else could that the \$11,000,000,000 owing the United States by Europe will be forgiven and canceled. The Senator from Idaho has correctly described the insidious propaganda that has been going on in this country for the cancellation of the European debt to us; he has resisted it in the past most vigorously; and it is surprising that, unintentionally, no doubt, a proposal now comes from that Senator which will give that propaganda a new impetus and will certainly postpone the funding of that indebtedness by the debt commission which has been created by Congress.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to an economic conference, provided it be understood before we assume the responsibility for calling it that cancellation of the European debts to us shall not be one of the matters for discussion, and provided that the President of the United States will have some assurance from the leading powers of Europe that the matters for discussion shall be such as reach the heart of the European question, namely, the abandonment of present policies of economic exploitation and rivalry which are preventing the economic rehabilitation of Europe.

As to this matter, I am willing to trust President Harding and Secretary Hughes. Surely they are as much interested in the subject as is the Senate. They certainly have more information upon it than we have. They are in a position to secure conditions and limitations to such a conference as are utterly lacking in the proposal before us.

One word in conclusion with respect to the farm bloc and what the Senator from Idaho has stated as to the agricultural interests of the country. I am not a member of the farm bloc, but I understand that the proposal of the Senator from Idaho finds favor with many of them upon the theory that it will tend to increase the price of farm products. Let me warn them that, in my judgment, that will not be the case, for a postponement of the settlement of European affairs means continuous disadvantage to the farmers of America, and I believe if the Senate adopts this proposition it will mean postponement of the rehabilitation of Europe, for, as I stated in the beginning, it will raise false hopes in Europe which never can be realized.

May I refer for a moment to a little of the history in connection with the Limitation of Armament Conference? The proposal for that conference, like the proposal for this economic conference, came first, so far as the Senate is concerned, from the distinguished Senator from Idaho. The conference was called; it completed its work; and I believe in importance that conference was second to none in the history of international conferences; and yet I can not forget that the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who was the first proponent of that conference in the Senate, opposed with all his great power and ability the four-power treaty, which made the naval-limitation agreement possible. So, Mr. President, if the proposed conference be held without a limitation or condition, as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho, I am afraid that, if the conference should come to an agreement, some of the Senators who are now favoring the proposal would be the first, when a treaty came to the Senate to ratify the work of the economic conference, to oppose it and render for naught all the work which the economic conference had accomplished.

Mr. President, it should be understood once for all, and before any conference is called, that there will be no cancellation of the European debt to us; that that shall not be a subject for discussion in any economic conference. If France is right in her view that Germany alone, defeated and crushed, can pay reparations amounting to \$30,000,000,000, then surely Europe can in time to come pay her indebtedness to us of one-third as much, \$11,000,000,000. Let us leave the matter where it is now, with the President of the United States. We can trust him to act as soon as any good can be accomplished by action, and if at any time the President shall request the assent of Congress for such a conference, I am confident that Congress will speedily give its assent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has quite characteristically made a speech in a Shylock vein in favor of the utmost exaction of the pound of flesh. He has spoken of the European debt to America. There is not a European debt to America, and of course he knows that. There is a debt from Belgium, a debt from Serbia, a debt from Italy, a debt from France, a debt from Great Britain. They are individual national debts due to the United States. To try to cover them all under a general phrase of being the indebtedness of Europe to the United States is illogical to start with and stupid to end with. A man who might be very unwilling to cancel a debt that Italy, France, or Great Britain happened to owe the United States might be very willing to cancel a debt that Belgium, overriden without cause, never really a party to the war, or Serbia, dragooned and intimidated, happened to owe to the United States. The European debt to the United States reminds me of the common protective tariff nonsense about trade between Germany and the United States, or France and the United States, or between countries, when there is not any trade between countries at all, but the trade is between the individual citizens of one country with the individual citizens of the other.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned—and the Senator dared anybody to say anything in favor of the cancellation of any debt that anybody owed to the United States—I think we ought never to collect a dollar that Belgium owes us, and I think we ought never to collect a dollar that Serbia owes us. I do not think that a man would feel quite like a gentleman when he was presenting a bill to either one of them; but I want to collect all the balance, and the most part of it is upon the other side.

Mr. President, the quarrel between the Senator from Idaho on the one side and the Senator from Massachusetts, reinforced by the Senator from Indiana, upon the other side, as to whether our representative at Lausanne now is a participant or an observer, is really amusing to me, and I reckon it is

to you. It does not make any difference whether you call him a participant or whether you call him an observer; he is doing things, and he seems to be doing them on the pathway toward ultimate right. My only quarrel is that he is not doing enough things. He ought to read the riot act to the unspeakable Turk, and tell him that assassinations and rape have to stop, and stop right now, and that the United States says so. Call him an observer or call him a participant or call him whatever you please, as a Democrat I indorse President Harding's sending him there and having him do at least as much as he has done, and I hope he will have him do more.

Mr. President, it is a great thing to be a Democrat. It is one of the grandest privileges in the world just to be a Democrat, to believe in equal opportunities and to disbelieve in special privileges; but, Mr. President, there is something even greater than being a Democrat, and that is being an American—being a member of the English-speaking race which transplanted its institutions to America. I love the Senator from Idaho so much that nobody is more delighted than I am to find that he has finally discovered that these United States are a part of the earth, and that he has finally discovered today that these United States are a part of Europe.

Did you ever think of that? Every drop of blood in our veins, except the niggers and the Chinese and the Japanese in the United States, is European. Our ancestry is European. We are a part of Europe just as much as Magna Græcia was a part of Greece, just as much as the Sicilian colonies from Greece were a part of Greece. We are a part of Europe, and we can not help it. It is in our blood, it is in our bone, it is in our sinew. We are not niggers, and we are not Japanese, and we are not Chinese; we are Europeans, and I am delighted to notice that the Senator from Idaho has finally seemingly approximated that realization, merely approximated it.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Senator's amendment. I have not consulted with anybody on this side nor with anybody on the other side, but I am in favor of it because it is "p'inted" the right way, as the darkies say; and I am opposed to any Lodge reservation, whether reinforced by the Senator from Indiana or by the Senator from Wisconsin, or not. God knows I have had enough of Lodge reservations to a generally idealistic purpose. I am in favor of the Senator's amendment, and I am opposed to any Lodge reservations. Lodge reservations can ruin anything that ever existed.

There is one thing, though, to which I wish to call attention before I sit down, because it was agreed to by both the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Wisconsin. They seem to think that the troubles of Europe now are economic. Well, of course, that is a part of the trouble, but the real trouble there, as during the entire history of the world it has been, is racial.

If you will let the energies of the people loose and quit confining them by governmental action, they will cure the economic troubles here and abroad; but nothing but the special grace of God can cure racial troubles between peoples. If we are to have another war soon in Europe, it will grow out of the Turk and the Balkans, and gradually Bulgaria and Greece and Serbia getting into it, and then finally the soviet in Russia backing the Turk out of hatred to civilization, not out of any natural affinity between Russians and Turks, and it will overflow the world. It is not economic at all. Of course, a part of the trouble with trade and exchange is economic, but there is no danger of war from economics at all. I have witnessed men here on this floor, at the beginning of the war between the Allies and Germany, and about the time we were participating in it, talking about it as if it were a contest of forces to out-trade one another. It had no more to do with that than it had with the wound on my off thumb, which was secured by slamming a door—nothing. The real trouble was growing out of a racial gospel that the Germans had preached for 40 years, recommending themselves to the other nations as being the chosen race of the world, and the balance of us as being degenerates. That was adopted by some college professors who were educated in Germany, and by three or four Senators upon this floor, strange as it may seem. They more or less admitted that the Germans were a superior race, most highly scientific, far ahead of us or anybody else; and it took us on the battle field, man to man, to prove to the German that he was not the special favorite of God at all. The trouble in Europe to-day is not chiefly economic at all, and when the Senator from Wisconsin says he is afraid that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho may go beyond that I hope he is right, because then maybe they can strike the center of the disease.

One more thing, Mr. President: The Senator from Idaho wanted to know why our few troops were still upon the Rhine. He pretended that he did not know why we were still upon the

Rhine. We were parties to the armistice into which Germany entered. One of the terms of the armistice was that we were to occupy the gateways across the Rhine, the Allies and the associated nations, and we are occupying the gateway at Coblenz; and, unless we withdraw from our plighted word under the terms of the armistice, we must continue to keep the United States flag there. It does not take many troops. It does not take any war; but the Senator from Idaho said that what we meant by keeping the troops there, to try to quote him accurately—I believe I took it down—was giving notice to Germany that we were there. That is just what it means. We did not fight this war for nothing. We did not whip Germany for nothing.

I have nothing against the German people. I love them. I have a whole lot of friends among them. I was partially educated amongst them. But we did not fight this war for nothing. We did not whip Germany for nothing. We did not enter into the armistice for nothing. We gave Germany notice when we entered into the armistice that she had to observe the terms of it, and although we never became party to the Versailles treaty we are still parties to the armistice. The Senator from Idaho is right. We are staying there to give notice to Germany—notice by our mere flag and a thousand men, I believe it is about a thousand—that she must remember and she shall not forget why we are there.

Again I say, it is a proud thing to be a Democrat, but it is a better thing to be an American; and I indorse President Harding's course in keeping those troops there, and I for one, am not afraid to say so.

The Senator from Idaho read a whole lot of communications from what he calls foreign-born societies that he said were constituents of his. They are not constituents of mine. Whenever a man hyphenates himself he is, in my opinion, not an American, and nobody except Americans are constituents of mine. No Irish-American or German-American or Italian-American or Hungarian-American or any other sort of hyphenated cattle has ever been invited by me to vote for me, and never will be. The minute they make up their minds to be Americans and leave out the hyphen, and to quit bringing European special interests into American elections, then they can count themselves as constituents of mine, but until they do they can not. Perhaps it is not a very proud thing to be a constituent of mine, but in my private opinion it is a very important thing; and no man can be a constituent of mine who is not an American, and an American all over, and is not willing to leave out his hyphen.

The Senator from Idaho refers to how much it is costing Germany to keep our American troops there. Well, thus far it has not cost Germany anything, if I am correctly informed. Under the terms of the armistice she agreed to pay, but she has not paid. By the way, as far as I can find out, she has not paid anything much, either under the treaty or under the armistice; so the Senator need not distress himself to death and have the stomach ache because of what Germany is paying for the occupation of our troops upon the Rhine. I am not quite certain about my facts, but if I have my facts right she has not paid anything, except during the first year, toward our troops occupying the Rhine. America has been in that, as she has been in everything else, financially unselfish. Whatever else may be said about us—lying down on our arms after the war was over, instead of extending the great success and triumph into peace, as we ought to have done—whatever else may be said about us, we have not been stingy about money. Thank God for that! We have been a gentleman nation when it came to the pocketbook. We have pulled out our money to feed and to clothe them, and we have left off all claims of ours against them for anything that ever happened. We have been a gentleman nation when it came to the pocketbook, and so we have not forced Germany to observe her armistice terms in paying for our army of occupation on the Rhine. If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, she has not paid one-tenth of it. In fact I believe—perhaps the Senator from Utah may remember better than I—that she paid only the first year; it may have been the first two years. Does the Senator remember?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do not remember just how much it was, but it was a very small amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, she has paid very little; so the Senator from Idaho need not go out stomach aching about our oppression of the Germans because of having a few of our men on the Rhine.

Mr. President, I remember that soon after the war was over there were men on this floor who rose time and again to vilify and vituperate Germany about everything in the world that they could think of, because that was temporarily popular then. I

remember that I had to check one or two of them; and now I find that the same men who were going too far in "cussing" Germany are going too far in consciously or unconsciously embracing German propaganda—I think mainly unconsciously. They do not know exactly what is being done, nor how it happens that they are doing it, but, anyhow, they are doing it.

Mr. President, I welcome every step, even though a short step, toward understandings between the nations and the peoples of the world. I was one of the very few men upon this side of the Chamber who voted for the four-power treaty. As I said to a distinguished Democrat who was on the other side of that question, I can not well see how I, who have advocated a league of peace between all the nations of the earth, could afford to oppose a league of peace between four nations of the earth. It is different in degree, but it is the same in kind.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho is going to do any particular good; I do not believe it is ever going to be allowed to come to a vote at this session, and I do not think it is going to be adopted. When I say it is not going to do any particular good, I mean unless the President is with it. Of course, if the President sends word to his men on the other side that he would like to have them vote for the Borah amendment it will be agreed to, and it will do some good; but if the President sends word to them that he does not want them to do it, it is not going to be agreed to, and it will not do any good, because it is never going to be enacted. But I am in favor of a dream, even if it is nothing but a dream, that looks toward peace on earth and good will among men.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask that we proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments to the pending bill.

Mr. KING. I understood that the committee amendments were all disposed of.

Mr. POINDEXTER. At least one of them was passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	Lodge	Poindexter
Bayard	Harris	McCormick	Pomerene
Borah	Harrison	McCumber	Reed, Mo.
Brookhart	Heflin	McKellar	Sheppard
Cameron	Hitchcock	McKinley	Smoot
Capper	Johnson	McNary	Stanfield
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Nicholson	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Oddie	Warren
Fernald	King	Page	Watson
Fletcher	Ladd	Pepper	Weller
France	La Follette	Philips	Williams
Gerry	Lenroot	Pittman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The READING CLERK. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 21, in the items for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, where the committee proposes to strike out "\$2,800,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,800,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon that I would like to ask the Senator from Washington having the bill in charge what reasons prompted the committee to increase the appropriation carried in the bill as it passed the House. As the Senator knows, the House committee had very full hearings, and I am advised that some testimony was presented with reference to this particular subject. The Senate committee has seen fit to increase the appropriation approximately a million dollars. Will the Senator advise the Senate the reasons which induced the committee to make such a large increase?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the purpose of the increase reported by the committee was to provide retainer pay for the volunteer Naval Reserve upon the same basis as is provided for the Federalized National Guard among our land forces. To all intents and purposes, while it is called a naval reserve, it is a naval militia. In order to induce men to interest themselves in the necessary training and to hold themselves in readiness for service in case of an emergency, certain retainer pay, equivalent to two months' pay of their several grades, is provided by the law.

When they have complied with the requisite drills and subjected themselves to the required amount of training they are eligible to be enrolled. When they are enrolled they are entitled to retainer pay. Last year the bill carried about the amount the bill carried this year as it came from the House without the Senate amendment, and in order to get along at all the Naval Reserve was not enrolled during the first six

months in the year; so the amount of money by which the appropriation was short was saved.

The first six months of the fiscal year was chosen by the department as the period in which the reserve would not be enrolled. They are expected to be enrolled on the 1st day of January and to be paid their retainer pay from that time until the 30th day of June. When that time arrives, unless the increased amount reported by the Senate committee is appropriated, they will have to be disenrolled again, and if that should occur, it is the opinion of those who are responsible and especially informed and especially active in the preservation of this civilian naval force, the Naval Reserve, that it would mean the destruction of the reserve; that if they are disenrolled again it would be impossible to retain such an interest in the reserve that they could ever again be enrolled.

They are expected to enroll on the 1st day of January, through the representations which have been made to them by their friends that they have reason to believe that provision would be made by Congress to keep them upon the enrolled list throughout the year after that time. These men are put upon Eagle boats and given two weeks' training at sea every year. In addition to that, they are required once a week to attend drills in armories, which are more or less makeshift affairs, no appropriation being made for the armories sufficient to procure the proper kind of armory. In their two weeks' training at sea 5 officers and 56 men are put upon a boat, and they are given very active boat drills; they are given instruction in engineering; they are given instruction in navigation, instruction in all duties of a seaman, and follow a very rigid regimen for the period of their active training. This amendment is offered to provide that retainer pay.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Washington, in charge of the bill, if he desires to proceed with the last clause of the bill to-night? There are several who want to speak upon this matter and are not ready to speak to-night.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has one or two matters he desires to present, one of them relating to the Marine Corps. That is the only remaining matter I know of to be presented, aside from the one of which the Senator from Idaho speaks. If anybody is prepared to speak this evening upon the question of the proposed conference, it seems to me it is a very appropriate time to proceed with that; but I will not ask that the matter be concluded this afternoon.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I have no objection to anyone speaking who wants to speak.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am perfectly willing, when we have proceeded as far as Senators are prepared to proceed, that we shall take a recess until to-morrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to offer two amendments, Mr. President. I will be glad to state at this time what the amendments refer to. I desire to have the number of the enlisted personnel of the Navy reduced. One amendment provides for a reduction of the enlisted personnel of the Navy from 86,000 to 67,000, that being the number suggested by the committee itself, as I understand its report. I suppose the amendment will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it very doubtful whether it will be reached this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can vote upon it at any time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to express the hope to those having charge of the naval appropriation bill that they will press it as vigorously as possible, so as not to hold back the unfinished business too long.

Mr. KING. May I say in reply to the Senator from Washington that I do not think he should by his admonition criticize the Senate. Here is a bill carrying an appropriation of more than \$325,000,000. Just one day has been spent in the consideration of the bill with that large appropriation. To-day has been consumed in the discussion of a very important question, and it is obvious that the bill will be passed by to-morrow. Certainly a bill which only takes three days to dispose of, though carrying these enormous appropriations, ought not to excite the ire of my friend from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I certainly did not manifest any indication of ire or anything of the sort, and it never entered my mind that I was criticizing the Senate or any Senator. I just thought that we should not adjourn at 4 or half past 4 o'clock without pressing the bill as much as possible and getting as much of it disposed of as possible. Of course, I did not make that suggestion with any idea of pressing Senators into debate when they had not had time to prepare. I merely wanted to express the hope that I did express, that the naval appropriation bill would be pressed as rapidly as it properly could be. But in

doing that I wish to say to the Senator that I never thought of criticizing any Senator or the Senate or expressing any impatience, because there has not been any unnecessary delay in connection with the bill.

Mr. KING. It occurs to me that if the Senate would give more consideration to these enormous appropriations, it would be for the best interests of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and is in charge of the pending appropriation bill. I should like to ask him to what extent the amount appropriated in the bill is lessened by the action of the disarmament conference which was held about a year ago. I recall that it was promised to us then that if that treaty were ratified, the expense of naval armament would be greatly reduced. That was one of the reasons, I think, why many Senators voted for the ratification of the conference action. If the Senator will give us the figures of the extent to which the cost of the Government has been relieved of the burden of naval taxation by reason of the accomplishments of the disarmament conference, I shall be glad to have them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The amount is something like \$180,000,000 in this bill; that is, comparing the needs for the ensuing fiscal year, for which the bill will provide, and those of the fiscal year 1922-23, the current fiscal year, which were \$180,000,000 less than the actual appropriations for the last year under the building program of 1916, which was modified by the naval limitation of armaments treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that we appropriated last year substantially the same amount of money that it is proposed to appropriate this year. Is not that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was just about the same approximately. The Senator will remember that last year's appropriation act was passed subsequent to the Armament Limitation Conference, and the reason why it was approximately the same as this year's bill was because of the suspension of the great naval program in which the United States was engaged prior to that conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Even now we are spending on our Navy about twice as much as we spent the last year before the war. Is not that true? We are spending more money by about 50 per cent than Germany ever spent on her navy in her palmiest days. Am I not correct in that? And still we are talking about peace and peace conferences. It looks to me like there is in the bill considerable preparation for war. Three hundred million dollars in round numbers are appropriated in the bill, and my recollection is that before the war we appropriated about \$150,000,000 a year for our Navy, and built up a great Navy under those appropriations. Now, we are nearly doubling that amount under the pending bill, even after the peace conference.

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the fiscal year 1917, the appropriations made during 1916, which was before we were in the war, the bill carried \$312,755,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will remember that was in preparation for the war. What was it the year before?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the year 1916 it was \$147,533,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and for a number of years prior thereto, before we actually were preparing for the war, it did not exceed that amount. Of course, we were preparing for war in 1916, as we all know. In the appropriation act for 1917 we were doing likewise, but prior to that we built up our Navy under appropriations of approximately \$150,000,000 a year, and for a number of years previously a much less sum each year.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We could go along this year on \$147,000,000 if it were the desire to go back to the before-the-war establishment, but we would have the smallest and the most incomplete Navy of all the great powers of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought one of the purposes of the disarmament conference was that we should reduce the expense of naval armament; but, instead of reducing, the Senator admits that we are going beyond what we did before the war by about 100 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not responsible for the expectations which the Senator from Tennessee may have had as to what reductions would be brought about. I think it is very probable that many people imagined there would be a doing away with the naval expenditures in large measure as a result of the scrapping of the partly constructed increase of the Navy—the battleships and battle cruisers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think many people were deceived by it at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has not come up to their expectations as to doing away entirely with naval expenditures, but

it has reduced the amount, as I have already pointed out to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. While I am on my feet I want to ask the Senator with reference to the enlisted men. I want to read from page 6 of the report of the committee which the Senator submitted on the pending bill. I read, for the purpose of asking him a question, as follows:

The appropriations proposed in this bill are on the basis of continuing the enlisted strength at 88,000 men. The committee made a very exhaustive study of the enlisted personnel requirements when considering the estimates for the current fiscal year and reached the conclusion that 67,000 enlisted men would provide adequately for the maintenance of the so-called treaty Navy, but only last April the House itself, contrary to the committee's recommendation, decided that 88,000 men should be allowed and nothing has arisen during the few intervening months that would warrant the committee in proposing a smaller number than the House so recently expressed itself as favoring.

Now, as I understand the excerpt from the committee's report, the committee believes that under the treaty arrangement, the disarmament arrangement, 67,000 men would be sufficient for the Navy, but that because the House last year voted for 88,000 men, the committee are willing to forego their own views after an exhaustive study of the subject and report for 88,000. Is that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the error into which the Senator from Tennessee has fallen is that he has the House committee report and the Senate committee report mixed up.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have here a report headed "Mr. Poindexter, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report," and included in that report is the report of the House committee from which I have just read. I supposed that when the Senator from Washington incorporated the House committee report into his report he recommended what the House committee report recommended.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no. We have shown that we did not do that by the amendments we have made to the House bill. We incorporated the House report—

Mr. McKELLAR. It was incorporated in the Senate committee report.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was going to explain why we incorporated the House report in our report. It was to show what the House report was, not necessarily that we indorsed everything that was in the House report. It is a quite clear and able statement of the views of the House committee and in general of the contents of the bill, because there were very few changes made in it by the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I understand the Senator does not agree with the House committee report which was submitted with his committee report, that 67,000 men are sufficient?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree, when the Senator reads from a report that the committee was of the opinion that 67,000 men were enough, that that was the Senate committee, which I understood him to intimate. It was the House committee that said that and not the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it the Senator's opinion that that number was not sufficient?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It certainly is. My opinion is that it was entirely inadequate and would put the Navy back somewhat on the basis existing before the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it would be very different.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It practically would deprive the Navy of its position as a sea power compared with the other sea powers of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now read further from the report which is submitted, together with the report of the Senator from Washington, as follows:

It was the position of the committee at that time—

That is when it made this exhaustive investigation after the disarmament conference—

that 50,000 men afloat would suffice for the 18-battleship fleet and all of the other types of vessels it was planned to keep in commission to round out that fleet and for special and detached service, and that 17,000 additional men would adequately take care of such shore assignments as it was usual and customary to fill with enlisted men, and allow a margin for men under training and in transit. Of course, the committee realized that the adoption of its proposal would have made it necessary, so far as the shore force was concerned, to exercise the closest supervision over the assignment and detail of men, and there would have been no reservoir from which enlisted men might be assigned to take the places of civilians forced out by reason of curtailed appropriations or to fill billets which properly should be filled by civilians.

Now, Mr. President, I find that the House committee, after an exhaustive examination of the subject, thought there was no need for more than 50,000 men. I will ask the Senator what

examination his committee made as to the number of men required?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know how much into detail the Senator desires us to go.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senate committee make any investigation at all?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It made a very exhaustive investigation, and that investigation was reported and printed in the hearings before the Senate committee of last year. The entire matter was fought out at the last session in a more or less sensational controversy on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It attracted the attention of the whole country, and any information which it was possible to obtain was used by one side or the other in the exhaustive debate on the floor of the other House. The same question, to a large extent, arose in the consideration of the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922. The Senate committee went into it in connection with that bill; they have repeatedly gone into an examination of the question as to the sufficiency of the personnel, and all of the testimony relative to that matter is contained in the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Washington will permit me to ask him another question in my own time I desire to inquire what is the average cost of the maintenance of an enlisted man in the Navy?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is approximately a thousand dollars a year, although I should have to examine the matter to give the Senator the exact amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's figures must be wrong. It costs nearly \$1,800 a year for an enlisted man in the Army, and I imagine the cost of an enlisted man in the Navy would certainly be approximately the same, at any rate. The Senator's figures go back about 15 years, when the cost of an enlisted man in the Navy and the Army approximated \$1,000 a year, but now it approximates something like from \$1,500 to \$1,800 a year. I thought perhaps the Senator from Washington had the figures before him, having had hearings in his committee about the matter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not the figures before me, but I will say there is a very great difference between the cost of the Army Establishment and the Navy Establishment. Quarters have to be provided for soldiers but they do not have to be provided, except to a very limited extent, for seamen.

Mr. McKELLAR. Except for those who were on shore duty; but the average would be considerably over \$1,000 a year. I am quite sure it would be not less than \$1,500 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to this matter that having 86,000 men in our Navy at this time is practically without justification. My understanding is that England, with her navy, which is much larger than ours, has not that many men now; that she has reduced her naval force constantly since the World War. It is the part of wisdom to do that. The number of men now in our Navy is too large; their maintenance is very expensive. A reduction in the enlisted personnel of the Navy from 86,000 to 67,000, as proposed in the amendment which I have offered, would effect a saving to the Government of \$30,000,000 a year, and I doubt if the retention of the additional 19,000 men would amount to a row of pins in the event we had trouble, for we should have to enlist a very much larger number of men immediately the war broke out. In my judgment, there is no reason in the world for putting this enormous cost for enlisted men upon the people of the United States at this time. We ought to follow the example of other nations. Whether we are going to live up to our treaty agreements or our professions when we participated in the disarmament conference or not, we certainly ought to act with prudence and caution, and not recklessly throw away the people's money, as we are evidently proposing to do in the pending bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee addressed to me a moment ago as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee a question relative to some of the provisions of the pending bill. I wish to state to him that under the new rules of the Senate the members of the Naval Affairs Committee—at least most of them—have absolutely nothing to do with the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. Therefore any information which I may have as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee is that which I have obtained from a perusal of the bill and from the reading of the testimony which was given before the House committee and the very limited amount of testimony which was taken by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator from Utah should hardly have stated that the Committee on Naval Affairs has nothing to do with the framing of the naval bill.

Mr. KING. I had not quite completed my statement.

Mr. WARREN. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Naval Affairs, under the rules of the Senate, choose three of their members to sit with the Appropriations Committee in considering the bill. No action is taken of any kind regarding the appropriations for the Navy by the Appropriations Committee without those members of the Naval Affairs Committee, both in the subcommittee and in the meeting of the general committee, being present; and they are always represented on the conference committee by one or two, and probably in the next conference they will be represented by three members. The Senator from Utah should keep that in mind.

Mr. KING. I had that in mind, and if the Senator from Wyoming had permitted me to complete the paragraph of my speech I should have explained the broad statement which I made was subject to the qualification which is contained in the rule to which I called attention; that a certain number of members of the Committee on Naval Affairs—and in this instance three—are selected to participate in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. However, I do not happen to be one of those three, so I may state broadly that only three members of the Naval Affairs Committee had anything to do with the preparation of the bill, and the remainder of us have only that information which we have acquired from an examination of the bill and the testimony before the House committee and the limited testimony which was taken before the Senate committee. So I can not give the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] the full information which he desired relative to the items to which he directed attention.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was called out of the Chamber for a moment and did not hear the statement of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I have just been explaining that under the new rules of the Senate the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the exception of three, have nothing to do with the preparation of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand about that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a moment ago we were discussing the item on page 13 of the pending naval appropriation bill relative to the Naval Reserve. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has given the reasons which actuated the Senate committee in increasing the appropriation above that carried in the House bill.

I have an open mind, let me say to the Senator, upon this subject. I profess to having but a limited amount of information respecting it. At first blush, it is a proposition that would address itself with a great deal of sympathy to my views. If we can have a naval reserve, although costing the people by taxation a comparatively large amount, which would be of value in the event of war, I can see that a measure that would execute that plan ought to commend itself to the country and to the Senate; but with the information which I have obtained I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that the plan thus far has not met with the success which many predicted and has many infirmities which are inherent and fundamental which prevent its being as successful as its proponents declared that it would be.

In the first place, our country is so large that any plan which might be successfully carried out in Great Britain, for instance, in the maintenance of a naval reserve could not as successfully be executed here. A number of persons who belong to the Naval Reserve, one officer and several enlisted men, have conferred with me in regard to the matter, and they declare that under the plan which has heretofore been adopted the results have not been commensurate with the expenditure. They state that only a few, perhaps 8,000 officers and men—and nearly one-half of them are officers—have maintained any connection whatever with the organization. They say that those who have associated themselves with the reserve have been persons residing in a few large cities or, at least, where the population is congested, so that we do not get a reserve which is based upon the population or which takes into account the wide extent of our great territorial domain. There are a considerable number of naval reservists in New York, in Boston, in Chicago, and a few other cities where the population is great, but in Iowa, Indiana, the great Mississippi Valley, and in the intermountain region, remote from the sea, there are but a very few members of the Naval Reserve, who have the advantage of the training, aside from the two weeks training which it is supposed will be given during the year. Of course, I can understand that a considerable number residing in the interior would join the reserve, if not for patriotic motives, for the opportunity of going to the seacoast for two weeks during the summer at the

pay which is allowed in the grade to which they belong, but if any benefit is to be derived from the training aside from the two weeks it will be confined largely and almost wholly to the few who belong to the reserve and who are found in the congested centers of population. That criticism was made. It was said that the talk about benefit being derived from the training is without any particular merit, and that but very few, if any, in the rural districts will obtain the benefit of the training. I am speaking now of the training aside from the two weeks at sea.

Another objection which was made by one of the young men who belonged to the Naval Reserve arose out of the fact, he said, that the boats upon which they were placed were not the ones which would be utilized in the event of war. The reserves are not placed upon battleships or battle cruisers or swift cruisers or torpedo boats or, at least, destroyers; but, as was indicated by the Senator from Washington, they are placed upon the little Eagle boats. It is quite likely that some benefit may be derived from training upon the Eagle boats, but, if I am to judge from the statement made to me by the gentleman to whom I refer, the benefit which is derived from the two weeks' cruise upon the Eagle boats is not very great and is not commensurate with the expenditure which is made. He ventured the assertion that it would be far better to enlarge the Navy, if that is what is desired, by a thousand seamen; and he said far better results would be attained with the augmentation of the Navy by 1,000 men than by the maintenance of the Naval Reserve system.

It does seem to me that if we are going to have the reserve the present plan should be greatly modified, simplified, and improved. There ought to be some plan by which the reservists will receive intensive training upon boats which will be used during war, not upon boats which are obsolete and which would give them no particular training that would be advantageous to them in the event of a naval conflict.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment which has been offered by the committee and support the provision as it came from the House. The House committee, as I have heretofore stated, gave a great deal of attention to this bill; that is, they gave it far more attention than did the Senate committee; and yet I am constrained to say that an examination of the testimony which was submitted before the House committee leaves very much to be said in favor of a fuller examination of witnesses. Much of the examination consists of the mere presentation by the naval officers of their demands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there was a much more complete showing made before the Senate Appropriations Committee or the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the subject of a Naval Reserve. Captain Parker, of Boston, who is probably more familiar with the subject than is any other individual, appeared before the committee and also prepared a written statement, which is much more definite and much more instructive than are the hearings from which the Senator has read.

Mr. KING. I was not reading from the House hearings with respect to this particular item. I was speaking generally and stating that while the House hearings were much fuller, generally speaking, and comprised a volume of seven or eight hundred pages, there was much left unsaid that ought to have been said to enable persons who desired to ascertain the condition of the Navy and the need of these appropriations to form a matured judgment as to the justification for these enormous appropriations. I have read what was stated in the Senate hearings, but the Senator will bear me out when I state that the Senate hearings were very much abbreviated. Perhaps there is less than 100 pages in the aggregate in the Senate hearing and six or seven or eight hundred pages in the House hearings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, when Captain Parker came here and testified before the Senate committee on the subject of the Naval Reserve we did not have a stenographer, and we held up the proceedings for 15 or 20 minutes waiting to get one, but could not get one; so his testimony does not appear in the hearings. It was very illuminating testimony on this subject, and I am sorry the Senator could not have heard it.

Mr. KING. I say I have read all the hearings which have been published, both before the House committee and before the Senate committee; and I confess that with respect to the Naval Reserve the testimony is very unsatisfactory, as it is with respect to many other items that are found in this bill.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has spoken about the proportion of officers to men in the reserve. I take it that he gets this information from page 151 of the House hearings. I myself made the same mistake that the Senator made. As a matter of fact, when a large number of men in the Naval Reserve were disenrolled, a small number of them went into class 6, which gets no pay. This table represents substantially that number of men. Quite a large number of officers stayed in class 6, but the men mostly went out. Since that time they have been building up the organizations and getting the men to enlist.

On page 151 the statement is made that at Portland, Me.—my own home town—there were seven officers and four men. I took exception to this when the matter came up in the committee, and I recalled that we used to have a Naval Reserve company there of something over 100 men and a proper number of officers, and the city of Portland took a great pride in the company. That seemed to be very different from the conditions mentioned in this statement. I now find, on talking with Captain Parker, who has charge of the first district, that they already have 8 officers and 30 men enrolled.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator what is the total number of officers and men now in the Reserve Force?

Mr. HALE. Until the 1st of January these men do not go in under pay. They simply remain in class 6; and that list on page 151 represents those men who were in class 6. Under the new arrangement, instead of 4,000 officers there will be somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000. They will not all go into the new class under pay, and the number of men will be cut down from 8,000 to somewhere below 6,000.

Mr. KING. Then, if I understand the Senator, with the enlarged appropriation carried by the Senate bill there will be less than 1,500 officers and approximately 5,000 men?

Mr. HALE. No; next year there will be more than 1,500. They hope to have 2,000 officers and substantially 6,000 men, whereas the appropriation for this year provided for 1,500 officers and 5,000 men, but applies for only six months of the year. If the Senator will read the hearings of last year he will see that the statement was made that they did not have retainer pay enough to take care of this full number of men, and therefore that they could only pay them for one-half the year. This year we hope to pay them for the full year.

Mr. KING. A reference to the House hearings, at pages 151 and 152, shows that the number of reservists attached to each station in each district, as shown upon those pages, is 4,440 officers and 8,751 men.

Mr. HALE. Those men do not go under pay, however.

Mr. KING. That is for 1924.

Mr. HALE. Those are the men who are enrolled in class 6 and who are not under pay. When they are taken in under the provisions of this bill they will be cut down in number and a certain number of them will go under pay.

Mr. KING. Then what becomes of the residue?

Mr. HALE. They keep on in class 6 without pay.

Mr. KING. What sort of an organization do they have and what drill?

Mr. HALE. They are honorary naval reserves, practically. They do not get any retainer pay.

Mr. KING. They do no drilling?

Mr. HALE. Not under pay.

Mr. KING. Neither on shore nor at sea?

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. KING. Then what advantage are they to the Navy?

Mr. HALE. They are interested in the reserve. They simply keep on and hold themselves in readiness in case of a war. They do not get any retainer pay at all.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator how the authorities would discriminate if all of them desired to join and get on the pay roll?

Mr. HALE. They would pick out the ones that were most suitable for the work.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that we ought to limit the number?

Mr. HALE. I do.

Mr. KING. At any rate, the proposition now is to expend approximately \$4,000,000 for the Naval Reserve, and with that \$4,000,000 to get enrolled approximately 1,500 to 2,000 officers and 5,000 men?

Mr. HALE. Five to six thousand men, yes; and I think it would be very well worth while for the country if we could make the plan successful.

Mr. KING. The Senator has heard the criticism that I made in regard to the present system. The Senator, as a member of the committee, has gone into the matter more fully than I

have, and I should like to inquire of him whether he is satisfied with the present system.

Mr. HALE. The Senator means with this system?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. HALE. For the Naval Reserve?

Mr. KING. With the present law.

Mr. HALE. I think eventually we shall have to enact a fuller Naval Reserve law. I think we should take that up in the Naval Committee, of which the Senator is a member.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps I did not understand the Senator from Maine. Did I understand him to say that these officers and men in the Naval Reserve do not drill?

Mr. HALE. Not these men that are left in class 6. All of the men that come under the appropriation in the bill will drill.

Mr. McKELLAR. All of them will drill?

Mr. HALE. They will.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am willing to take a vote. I think we should reject the Senate amendment and adhere to the House provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, in the items for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, on page 13, line 21, to change the total from "\$2,994,000" to "\$3,994,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee about a provision in the bill, on page 9, for the Office of Naval Intelligence. I see that there is \$30,000 appropriated for that purpose. Can the Senator tell us anything about the advantage of an appropriation of that kind? I call his attention to the fact that some days ago there was printed in the papers a statement from New York showing that more than \$1,000,000 worth of Navy material had been stolen and that the Office of Naval Intelligence knew nothing about it, and it was ascertained through arrests made at the instance of the Department of Justice. If such is the case, if the Office of Naval Intelligence does not function, if it does not prevent this kind of a theft, why should we appropriate the amount contained in this proviso for that purpose?

Mr. POINDEXTER. What proviso does the Senator refer to?

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 9, the Office of Naval Intelligence.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator any other criticism of the Office of Naval Intelligence except what he has just mentioned?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should say that this was enough. I read from the Evening Star of December 20 the headline:

Million-dollar theft from navy yard is charged to 23. Twenty-two are arrested in New York by Federal agents. Clothing and material is taken by truck load. Detectives pose as thieves, are accepted by men, and get evidence.

Without reading all the article, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put the whole article in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, December 20, 1922.]
\$1,000,000 THEFT FROM NAVY YARD IS CHARGED TO 23—22 ARE ARRESTED IN NEW YORK BY FEDERAL AGENTS—CLOTHING AND MATERIAL ARE TAKEN BY TRUCK LOAD—DETECTIVES POSE AS THIEVES, ARE ACCEPTED BY MEN, AND GET EVIDENCE.

(By the Associated Press.)

NEW YORK, December 20.—Twenty-two civilian employees at the Brooklyn Navy Base were arrested to-day on indictments returned several months ago by a Federal grand jury charging that Government property to the value of more than \$1,000,000 had been stolen since the war.

The arrests were made by agents of the Department of Justice.

The grand jurors indicted 23 men after its investigation of the alleged wholesale thefts, which the authorities said included clothing, oil, and various other materials used at the navy yard. The twenty-third man under indictment was not found to-day. The investigation has been under way for months.

YARD DETECTIVES FAIL.

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand; but the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

William J. Burns, chief of the bureau of investigation of the Department of Justice, then was asked for help, and ordered Edward J. Brennan, head of the bureau's New York office, to assign operatives.

Brennan consulted Police Commissioner Enright and borrowed the services of Detective Francis Trainor.

Under the direction of Federal Agents Robert Walsh and Ralph Navarro and Detective Trainor, men were put into the warehouses as checkers, laborers, watchmen, and bookkeepers.

WERE WATCHED CLOSELY.

These detectives found themselves watched narrowly until they took advantage of opportunities obviously put in their way of stealing small articles, such as wrist watches and marine glasses. Not until they actually concealed these articles and pretended to steal them were they able to get any evidence against the men now in custody.

They then learned that Government property was being stolen by the truck load, including great boxes of clothing, paint by the barrel, crates of glass, and commercial alcohol by the gallon. Instances were found in which waste and salvage bought by contractors was substituted by new goods or by other merchandise than that mentioned in the contract; in other cases twice the quantity of actual salvaged stuff contracted for was delivered.

START OF WIDE CLEAN-UP.

It was indicated by prosecuting officials that to-day's arrests were but the start of a general clean-up involving Navy warehouse laborers, elevator operators, clerks, chauffeurs, watchmen, and packers, as well as fences, junkmen, and other accomplices on the outside.

Some of the missing material was said to have been located in warehouses in Brooklyn and Manhattan, and it was announced that the United States attorney would be asked to take steps for its recovery.

Government operators and detectives reported to Washington shortly after they began operations that heads of some of the departments in the buildings were the ring leaders in the conspiracy.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call attention to this part of it, without reading it all:

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand, but the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

Then it goes on to show how the Department of Justice had accomplished the discovery. It seems to me we probably had better leave these matters to the Department of Justice, and not appropriate money for the purpose of keeping up a department that seems absolutely unable to cope with the situation. If \$30,000 is the amount provided for the Office of Naval Intelligence, I take it that it is wholly inadequate to effect the purpose, and it ought to be cut out of the bill entirely, in view of this report from New York. It seems to me we had better leave it to the agents of the Department of Justice and save that much money for the people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator has answered his own question. He just pointed out that \$30,000 was not enough money to employ detectives to guard all of the property of our Navy, with stations on both coasts. The purpose of the Office of Naval Intelligence is primarily of an entirely different character. I do not understand that the Senator from Tennessee has any objection to the use of the secret service or of the agents of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to apprehend criminals who commit crimes against the United States. That is one of the purposes for which it is organized. In fact, that is one of the purposes for which the Department of Justice was established and is maintained. The Senator says that we had better make appropriations for the Department of Justice to do this work, and that is exactly what we do, and that is why the Department of Justice investigated the matter, and apparently investigated it successfully.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then that makes it all the more imperative that this provision of the bill should be stricken out, and I will offer an amendment to strike it out, for the reason that evidently this is just one of those things which have grown up in the department which ought to be corrected, a number of employees drawing from \$1,800 to \$2,000 a year who make a plaything of this naval intelligence, and while it is their duty to prevent the very kind of theft that is mentioned in this newspaper article they did not do it. I imagine that any kind of naval intelligence that could not keep up with a theft of that sort, done almost openly and in the manner pointed out in this article, surely ought to be abolished. Let us leave the investigation of that sort of thing to one department. Why have two departments doing it? The trouble is that in these various departments we have duplication of service, and what is everybody's business is nobody's business. We ought to strike this out entirely, and ought to put the duty upon the Department of Justice to prevent such thefts from the Navy Department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is not necessary to go into a defense of the officers of the Naval Intelligence. I am acquainted with them. I do not know to what extent the Senator from Tennessee has personal knowledge of this office, in condemnation of which he has just spoken. My opinion is that instead of being useless men, as he describes them, men who are interested only in drawing their pay, there are no harder-working officers of the Government, no more competent or able officers, and none more successful in performing the services for which they are employed and for which their

office is established. They gather information from all parts of the world for the use of the Navy in the bearing it may have on naval activities. The Senator picks up an article in a newspaper and, without further information, apparently accepts as accurate its statements about the case to which he refers. As a lawyer, I do not think if he were put upon the responsibility of acting upon this matter he would act upon any such evidence as that, nor would he condemn an office of the Navy as he has condemned this, if he were speaking seriously and really undertaking to decide the matter, without making further investigation of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am endeavoring to make that investigation in the very place where it should be made, and in the very manner, and the only manner, in which Senators can investigate such a subject. The Senator having the bill in charge has reported a bill making a certain appropriation, and I have produced this article, which very greatly reflects upon this service of the Navy. As I understand, the Senator does not know what the facts are. We have had no report about them. There has been no answer to this article, so far as I know, and I would really like to know, before this bill is passed, whether the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy has permitted these thefts by negligence, or in what way they have been permitted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator take the position that this little office, maintained on an appropriation of \$30,000, ought to prevent all crimes in connection with the Navy?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Or ought to prevent the commission of any theft?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but this article said they were there, but that the thieves were too cunning for them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know that the article states the facts as they actually were?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is an Associated Press article, and by long experience we have found that the Associated Press is generally very accurate. The Associated Press would not dare to make charges against officers of the Navy which could not be substantiated, in my judgment. I believe that almost any lawyer, or any other man with good intelligence and a knowledge of the character of this institution, whether he was a lawyer or not, would say the same thing. The Associated Press is not going to print head lines like these, a significant article like this, a sensational article like this, and give it out unless there is something behind it; and it seems to me an explanation is due from the department about this enormous theft of naval material. We appropriate nearly \$300,000,000 a year for this department for all sorts of purposes. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] reminds me it is over \$300,000,000; and that is true, because there are a lot of unexpended balances reappropriated in this bill, bringing the total up to something like three and a quarter million dollars a year. Under these circumstances it does seem to me that when the Associated Press charges an office in the Government with having permitted thefts amounting to a million dollars or more, before we appropriate additional money to keep up that office there ought to be some explanation of the matter and some excuse at least given for these officers who apparently have neglected their duties.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will give the Senator an explanation. The explanation is that it is not the duty of the Office of Naval Intelligence to maintain guards at the warehouses where the property of the Navy is stored. There is no appropriation made for that purpose, and it would be utterly impossible for them to do it, even if they undertook it. Of course, the Associated Press is a great institution, and I join with the Senator in his eulogy, but even the Associated Press is very often misinformed and mistaken in what it has printed. The Senator's attention has been attracted by that, and he wants to be informed about it. It is not the business of the Office of Naval Intelligence to do what they have been charged with neglecting, but if the Senator is really looking for information, I have no doubt that the Office of Naval Intelligence or the Secretary of the Navy will be very glad indeed to give him a full report on that matter. No doubt he could have had a report on it if he had asked for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am a little surprised that the Associated Press would accuse these officers of doing something it was not their business under the law to do. The Senator from Washington says that it was not their business to look after this matter. The charge in the Associated Press dispatch is that they were actually looking after it, but were incompetent to do it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let me correct the Senator in his quotation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard what the Senator said. Of course, I am perfectly willing to have him correct it or change it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator heard what I said, but he did not hear correctly, or else misquoted me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not intend to do so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What I said was a comment on the remark of the Senator from Tennessee to the effect that these officers were charged with malfeasance or incompetence in permitting this crime to occur. I said that it was not their business to prevent the commission of crimes or to maintain guards over naval property.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what they were charged with:

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand.

Apparently this was their business and they were executing it, carrying out, or attempting to perform, the duties of their office. Then the article goes on to say:

But the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

It does seem to me that this is a very grave charge against this office of the Navy, over a million dollars' worth of goods being stolen. Of course, in the Senate and in the House we appropriated money very freely, other people's money, and we forget that a million dollars amounts to anything. What is a million dollars—a little, trifling sum like a million dollars! No Senator ought to rise in his place and ask about the loss of a million dollars in a bureau of the Government! But it does seem to me that a million dollars is a considerable sum, and it is a sum about which we ought to make some inquiry. An officer of the Government is charged by the Associated Press in all the papers of the land with working on discrepancies, which afterwards turned out to be the stealing of a million dollars' worth of goods, and it does seem to me that the department should furnish a statement of the facts. If those officers have been guilty of such gross negligence, if it was their duty, as this article charges it was their duty, to prevent this very kind of theft, and they have failed in their duty, surely we should not undertake to appropriate money to keep those men in office. I hope the Senator will let this go over until to-morrow, so that we can find out something about this affair, who was to blame for it, and what steps have been taken to punish those who are responsible for it. There is no reason in the world why a million dollars' worth of goods of the Navy Department should be stolen, and where that has happened there has been wrongdoing somewhere, and it ought to be investigated by the department, and Congress ought not to appropriate additional money to keep that sort of men in office until there has been an investigation of it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have heard nothing in the account the Senator has read which would lead me to suppose that the Office of Naval Intelligence was charged with the responsibility of guarding those stores. Those stores were stolen, and afterwards the Office of Naval Intelligence was apparently set to work to find out who committed the theft. As yet they have apparently not been successful in locating the guilty parties. They may be able to do so before they get through. Similar things happen in cases coming before the civil authorities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why maintain that office, if the officers are utterly unable to even ascertain that \$1,000,000 worth of goods are gone?

Mr. HALE. That happened very recently.

Mr. McKELLAR. An intelligence officer of that kind could not detect bear tracks in a snowstorm here on the Capitol Grounds. It would be impossible for him to detect anything if he could not detect the loss of \$1,000,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Nobody could do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know; I think if I saw bear tracks in front of me in the snow I could tell what they were.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator might give the department a little time to work out the problem.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing that this should go over until to-morrow, and I hope it will. If the officers have not been derelict in their duty, of course the criticism that is here offered is not right; but the charge standing unexplained, we ought not to appropriate any more money for an office of that kind. I have offered the amendment to-night, and I hope the Senator will let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there is a committee amendment pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 21, in the total for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, to strike out "\$2,994,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,994,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that all the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the following amendment: On page 9, line 1, I move to strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 9, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as follows:

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

For employees in the Office of Naval Intelligence, \$30,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except two persons at \$2,000 each.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is now 5 o'clock and I think we had better have an executive session, as I understand it is desired to have one.

I opposed the plan of Republican leaders of keeping here during the Christmas holidays Senators who have been here all the year attending regularly the sessions of the Senate. I am not willing that some of us who have been here all day remain here any longer when others have gone home for the night. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum unless—

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will withhold that for a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thought the Senator suggested having an executive session?

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from Washington is ready to go into executive session and end the legislative session now I shall withhold the point of no quorum. You forced us to remain here during Christmas and you have got to have a quorum to transact business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Thursday, December 28, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 27, 1922.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surgeon Julian M. Gillespie to be surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from December 30, 1921. This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination required by law.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The following-named officers of the Department of Commerce to occupy the positions held by them under recess appointments:

Aaron George Katz, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Charles Mitchell Thomas, of Virginia, to be aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Ralph Henry Lewis, from December 13, 1922.

CHAPLAINS.

To be chaplains with the rank of captain.

Chaplain Emil William Weber, from October 5, 1922.

Chaplain John Oscar Lindquist, from October 10, 1922.

Chaplain Alexander Wayman Thomas, from October 19, 1922.

Chaplain Frank Connors Rideout, from October 23, 1922.

Chaplain Alfred Cookman Oliver, jr., from October 24, 1922.

Chaplain Pierre Hector Levesque, from November 7, 1922.

Chaplain John Hall, from November 16, 1922.

Chaplain Edward Lewis Trett, from November 27, 1922.

Chaplain Charles Coburn Merrill, from November 28, 1922.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

MARINE CORPS.

Col. Rufus H. Lane, assistant adjutant and inspector, to be the adjutant and inspector of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from the 2d day of January, 1923.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of January, 1923.

Luther A. Brown, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for a probationary period of two years, from the 20th day of December, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Carrie B. Yett to be postmaster at Safford, Ariz., in place of E. M. Dial. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

ARKANSAS.

Monroe J. Gogue to be postmaster at Rector, Ark., in place of C. M. Cox, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Elizabeth Tyler to be postmaster at Randsburg, Calif., in place of Josephine Montgomery, resigned.

CONNECTICUT.

William J. Reel to be postmaster at Canaan, Conn., in place of E. L. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Carrie A. Bush to be postmaster at Watertown, Conn., in place of E. P. McGowan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Andrew H. Stapler to be postmaster at Metter, Ga., in place of A. H. Staples, to correct name.

ILLINOIS.

Jesse E. Miller to be postmaster at Cairo, Ill., in place of Bernard McManus, jr. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Walter H. Sass to be postmaster at Monee, Ill., in place of R. M. Freese. Office became third class April 1, 1922.

William W. Renton to be postmaster at Wheaton, Ill., in place of W. V. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

Willard G. Minard to be postmaster at Bourbon, Ind., in place of J. N. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lester L. Wildman to be postmaster at Dupont, Ind., in place of G. A. Wilhelm, resigned.

Phineas O. Small to be postmaster at Laporte, Ind., in place of J. A. Terry. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Odin R. Smith to be postmaster at Martinsville, Ind., in place of Lewis Sartor. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

James S. Wright to be postmaster at Vevay, Ind., in place of E. F. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

IOWA.

William G. Wood to be postmaster at Alvia, Iowa, in place of J. M. Gass. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Elmer G. Warrington to be postmaster at Keota, Iowa, in place of G. H. Helscher. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Raymond S. Blair to be postmaster at Parkersburg, Iowa, in place of J. R. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Gabriel L. Archer to be postmaster at St. Charles, Iowa, in place of H. R. Hurlbut. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John B. Rose to be postmaster at Chester, Mass., in place of J. J. Harrington. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Nellie M. Watkins to be postmaster at Clinton, Minn., in place of F. W. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Gunhild Sollom to be postmaster at Holt, Minn., in place of Racine Olson, declined.

Carl A. Ecklund to be postmaster at Marine on St. Croix, Minn., in place of C. A. Ecklund. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Norman Hanson to be postmaster at Renville, Minn., in place of W. L. Poseley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

George R. Truex to be postmaster at Red Bank, N. J., in place of Frank Pittenger. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Wade E. Gayer to be postmaster at Fulton, N. Y., in place of P. T. Conley. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Samuel W. Berry to be postmaster at Maybrook, N. Y., in place of G. M. Pierson. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

Lewis E. Elston to be postmaster at Unionville, N. Y., in place of L. E. Elston. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John W. Kelly to be postmaster at Jonesboro, N. C., in place of B. R. Avent. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

OHIO.

Edward C. Anderson to be postmaster at Blanchester, Ohio, in place of M. A. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

George H. Lewis to be postmaster at Geneva, Ohio, in place of W. M. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Robert B. Morford to be postmaster at Lawton, Okla., in place of Robert Landers. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank H. Keth to be postmaster at Summerville, Pa., in place of J. E. Guthrie, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Virginia M. Bodie to be postmaster at Wagener, S. C., in place of Virginia Gantt. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

William M. Brewer to be postmaster at Collinwood, Tenn., in place of S. E. Byler, deceased.

Alvin M. Stout to be postmaster at Greenfield, Tenn., in place of P. D. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

TEXAS.

William M. Bowen to be postmaster at Beckville, Tex., in place of J. W. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Minnie L. Landon to be postmaster at Burnet, Tex., in place of L. S. Chamberlain, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Hugh W. Cunningham to be postmaster at Ellasville, Tex., in place of E. J. Smith, removed.

Lee Hood to be postmaster at Justin, Tex., in place of W. A. Leuty, removed.

Willie O. Brents to be postmaster at Whitewright, Tex., in place of H. L. Webster, removed.

UTAH.

Lydia R. Shaw to be postmaster at Huntington, Utah, in place of A. M. Truman. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

VIRGINIA.

William H. Ruebush to be postmaster at Dayton, Va., in place of C. A. Funkhouser. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

S. Clyde Bliss to be postmaster at Farmville, Va., in place of J. L. Hart, deceased.

Thomas P. Farrar to be postmaster at Ivy Depot, Va., in place of H. G. White. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Emmett W. Brittle to be postmaster at Wakefield, Va., in place of L. E. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

WYOMING.

Percy G. Matthews to be postmaster at Evanston, Wyo., in place of J. H. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 27, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Harry W. Haskell, Indio.

Lewis P. Hathaway, Ventura.

MINNESOTA.

Edwin Mattson, Breckenridge.
Carl G. Hertig, Buffalo Lake.
John S. Stensrud, Canby.
Herman C. Rustad, Kerkhoven.
Arthur C. Omholt, Sacred Heart.
Everett R. Vitalis, Shafer.
Einar S. Rydberg, Spooner.

NEBRASKA.

James J. McCarthy, Greeley.
Edward E. Ely, Milford.
Elmer G. Watkins, Orleans.
Chester C. Alden, Whitman.

OREGON.

Flora A. Fowler, Goble.
Lawrence S. McConnell, Sherwood.
Mart Griffin, Umatilla.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Frank D. Beste, Corsica.
Benny P. Humphreys, Reliance.
Jacob L. Bergstreser, Willow Lake.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 27, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of life and light, of time and eternity, the world is Thine and Thou art near. We have only to wait to hear Thy voice and to feel Thy presence. We thank Thee that we are not the victims of chance and fate, but we live in Thy life and move in Thy strength. With us may the happiness and comfort of all be the object of each. As Thou art above all and over all, so help us to think, to feel, and to speak with good will toward all and hate for none. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 23, 1922, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, in South Carolina, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider H. R. 13559, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill be limited to an hour and a half, three-quarters of an hour on each side, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and one-half by myself.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about an hour on this side.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask for two hours of general debate, of which one-half is to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill; and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to two hours, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending